

forces will be governed by Canadian law and discipline will be administered under our own Canadian system. As I say, the question is being reviewed now in the United Nations.

"Mr. PEARKES. Would that apply to any civil offense which might be alleged against a Canadian soldier?"

"Mr. CAMPNEY. Yes. We have taken the view that that should obtain. Whether or not we will maintain that, whether other courts of an international nature will be set up or what the final disposition will be I do not know, but as for now that is our contention."

"Mr. PEARKES. I should like to express the opinion that it is very desirable that we remain firm in that stand."

"Mr. CAMPNEY. We feel quite strongly about it."

There is not sufficient time this morning to go into the circumstances surrounding the making of these agreements, the motives of the negotiators, the pressure put upon the Senate to consent to the only treaty presented to it, and what now appears downright misrepresentation of facts and law to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have had almost 4 years of experience with the agreements and need not theorize. We should face the facts.

#### ACTION NEEDED

In May 1955, I presented to the House of Representatives a resolution which would have directed the President to seek a modification of all such agreements so that the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over

our servicemen abroad for off-duty offenses would be restored to the United States. Failing such modification being secured, the President would have been directed to terminate such agreements in accordance with the terms of each. Although extensive hearings were held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee voted 19 to 10 not to report the resolution to the House. I think the testimony and evidence offered in the hearings clearly showed the necessity for its adoption. Accordingly, I have again offered an identical resolution to the House which is designated House Joint Resolution 16. I might add that some of my colleagues have joined with me in offering identical resolutions, just as they did in the previous session.

I have found that there is another vacuum of information or knowledge about this matter among the American people. This is not surprising, when I know that we have had inquiries from other congressional offices as to what the Status of Forces Agreement is, or what my resolution is about. So there is much work to be done to inform our citizens of the dangers inherent in foreign service in our Armed Forces.

That is where you patriotic women can be of great help.

Inform your friends, particularly any who may have sons, husbands, or other relatives now in service or about to enter service. Generate a demand on the Congress for action. Find out where your Representative stands on this subject. Tell him your views, particularly if he is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I feel confident that

if my resolution is presented to the full body for action that it will be adopted. It is necessary that we have such an expression of the will of the people in order to recover the rights of our servicemen on duty abroad.

#### RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 31ST WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, INC.

##### RESOLUTION NO. 8—NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas until July 15, 1953, American service personnel on duty in foreign countries were under United States military courts, thus retaining their rights as United States citizens while serving our country abroad; and

Whereas the ratification on July 15, 1953, of the Status of Forces Treaty of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has deprived our servicemen of the traditional protection extended by our Constitution and enjoyed by United States servicemen on foreign soil, and now subjects our men to trial, imprisonment, and even the death penalty under foreign laws in foreign civil courts and prisons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 31st Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions the Congress of the United States to support legislation which would nullify that part of the NATO treaty referring to the status of forces which deprives American servicemen of the protection of the United States Constitution when serving in more than 50 countries of the world.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who art here and everywhere, we thank Thee for the wise and bountiful provision which Thou art daily making for our spiritual and material welfare.

We penitently confess that we frequently demand and try to gain so much from life for ourselves and are little concerned about giving help and happiness and hope unto others.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may be coworkers with Thee in the glorious adventure of supplying every human need and of establishing on earth the kingdom of brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who was the world's greatest servant and its only savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the

50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, of Georgia; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama; Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa; Hon. GORDON McDONOUGH, of California.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

#### DO NOT WEAKEN THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard represents the development of our citizen-soldier tradition.

One of its major functions is to meet emergencies in the several States.

It is also a first line of reserve for the regular or professional Military Establishment.

The proposal, by the Defense Department, that all enlistees in the guard shall be required to complete 6 months of active-duty training with the Army, although understandable in its attempt to create a large, trained, and immediately available reserve, is not the only solution nor the desirable one.

The whole concept of National Guard training is that it will permit and attract men for military training without disrupting their jobs or homelife.

It is designed to provide "a well-regulated militia," as specified in the Constitution. It is separate and distinct from the Regular Army.

To my mind the only question is how to increase its technical proficiency, without destroying the base upon which it relies for its existence. The proposed requirement for 6 months' active duty would dry up enlistments and regulate it out of existence. This could be a thinly disguised maneuver to eliminate the National Guard and to completely federalize all military components.

Like most Americans, I have a high regard for our professional soldiers, but I have also observed how much of a trainee's time is wasted under the "hurry up and wait" programing.

Instead, I believe it is the responsibility of the regulars to streamline their training methods and provide an accelerated course.

The National Guard Association has recommended a fair compromise especially regarding men who have had no previous military experience. Otherwise active-duty training should be on a voluntary basis, consistent with the organization and the function of the National Guard.

We, in Massachusetts, are proud of the combat records of our National Guard units.

We resent and oppose any plan, however devious, to discredit the guard or to destroy its identity.

The arbitrary and coercive action of the Defense Department must be repudiated.

Let the guard, with its professional advisers, develop methods for realistic training close to home, that will approximate Army standards without destroying the base upon which the guard relies for its personnel and its very existence.

Pentagon politics must not be permitted to obscure the place and the value of our citizen-soldier reserve.

#### POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes political contributions to candidates for elective Federal offices in amounts up to \$100 annually.

This is essentially the same as a bill I sponsored in the House in 1955 and which was sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]. He has reintroduced the measure this year.

This bill would enlarge the base of political participation by encouraging modest political contributions from the average voter, thus reducing the dependence of candidates and parties on the large contributors.

Need for such a measure has been emphasized by the detailed study of campaign contributions and expenditures announced this week by the Senate subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Others needs illuminated by that report would be taken care of in a bill I have already introduced in the House—H. R. 4146—and which the senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] has introduced in the Senate—S. 426. This bill, little changed from one which was reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee 2 years ago, would set realistic limits on campaign expenditures by candidates and committees set up to help them. At the same time, it would effectively limit the total amount of contributions which any person could make.

Enactment of both the \$100 exemption and the improved Corrupt Practices Act bills would go far toward removing many of the present faults in our elections processes.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 88)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 1957.

#### HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 21)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 1957.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### INDIAN HOSPITALS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2021) to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals and to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### DEFERRED GRAZING PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate,

which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, which is the bill concerning the drought situation in the Southwest. It provides a program for deferred grazing and soil conservation in the area that has been afflicted for a number of years by a very severe drought.

The Committee on Agriculture has reported the bill unanimously and has asked for the type of rule which has just been read to you. There was no objection to the consideration of the bill in the Rules Committee. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and the rule unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that this bill is before us this afternoon. It should have been passed the day before yesterday. I am sure, but for some kind of misunderstanding, it would have been passed at that time. I cannot believe



that the minority leader would have delayed the action which was scheduled last Monday had he understood the problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that make any difference—any particular difference?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know that it makes a bit of difference in the world to the gentleman from Michigan, but probably it makes a difference to some others.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it make any difference to anybody. I was not asking just about myself.

Mr. POAGE. I can only answer for myself. I think that it makes considerable difference.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad the gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, wait a minute now, just a minute.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not satisfied. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman. The gentleman can get time on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham, has made it impossible for the chairman of our committee to present this legislation to the House.

I shall, therefore, attempt to explain the measure. This bill is but an attempt to give some slight degree of protection to the soils in the vast drought-stricken area of the United States. This is not a relief bill. This bill does not solve the drought-distress problem. This bill is not a bill that will take care of the immediate needs of the farmers and ranchmen who have suffered so severely from the drought. It is to be hoped that we will have legislation that will extend a far larger measure of relief to these people. The President and the Secretary of Agriculture made a visit in the drought-stricken area something more than 3 weeks ago. They stated at that time that such action as could be taken would be taken in behalf of the drought area. They did not pass upon this legislation. This legislation is not an outgrowth of that visit. This legislation is not even connected with that visit. It was introduced sometime before that visit was made. The situation was so serious that 22 Members introduced identical bills. This bill bears my name, but Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma; Mr. BROOKS of Texas; Mr. BURLESON, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. DIES, of Texas; Mr. DOWDY, of Texas; Mr. FISHER, of Texas; Mr. IKARD, of Texas; Mr. KILGORE, of Texas; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. ROGERS of Texas; Mr. RUTHERFORD, of Texas; Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. YOUNG, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON of Texas; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. DIXON, of Utah; and Mr. CHRISTOPHER, of Missouri, all introduced identical bills. This action surely attests to the seriousness of the

situation. This bill is not an attempt to evaluate the things that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture saw, nor is it an attempt to suggest that at some future day the President or the Secretary or both may not very properly come up here and make suggestions as to further legislation. As one member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure I speak for all, we will welcome any such suggestions at any time they are presented. But, up until this good moment, no suggestions whatsoever for the relief of the drought-stricken area have been presented to the Committee on Agriculture by either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, and our committee knows that action is needed now. The drought does not wait, and we should not be asked to wait further. The President can still come—the Secretary can still come to Congress at any time either decides he wants to suggest any further aid for the drought sufferers. We will still be glad to have their suggestions, but we should not refuse to do what we can do at this time, just because the President and the Secretary do not have any thoughts to offer. This bill will not end the drought; it will not bring rain—but every member of our committee thought it would help. It is not a Democratic measure. It is not a partisan measure. It is a bill which comes to you with the unanimous recommendation of all of the members of our committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not correct to say that the substance and the principle embodied in this legislation already has been acted upon favorably by this House in the previous session when we had the soil-bank legislation before us?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman correctly expresses it, although this House in the Albert amendment went much farther than this bill goes. The far-reaching Albert amendment was adopted by a majority vote of this House. We proposed at that time to extend the principle of deferred grazing all over the Nation, whether there was any emergency, drought, or disaster, or not. It was in a sincere effort to meet the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture to that amendment, that this bill was introduced. The Secretary stated at the time that amendment was adopted that he felt it was not a proper part of the soil bank. He felt it was improper to include grazing provisions in the soil bank. No objection was raised to the idea of encouraging deferred use of pasture land. So we introduced these bills, carefully amending only the disaster relief program and not touching the soil-bank program at all, in the sincere belief that by so doing we were meeting the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture. We confined this bill and its operation to those counties that have been declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be disaster areas. This bill is not of universal application, but deals only with those counties that have been found to be suffering from serious disaster.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, when he finds that it would

be desirable for the protection of the soil to encourage deferred grazing shall promulgate a program of deferred grazing, in which he is authorized to pay to the landowner not less than the normal rental value of the land for not less than 12 months, but not to exceed more than 3 years after the termination of the disaster. Frankly, that is all that is left in the bill, because section 5 has been removed by the committee, and there will be a committee to take section 5 out of the bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I think I heard you say this took care of so-called distressed drought areas.

Mr. POAGE. That is all.

Mr. WIER. The meat of your bill is for the Southwest drought areas. How about the drought area that has been placed under distress conditions in South Dakota?

Mr. POAGE. This bill covers every area that has been declared a disaster area. Unfortunately the larger part of those disaster areas are in 6 or 7 Southwestern States, but these disaster areas do extend over nearly half of the United States.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman inform the House if this was not done, or similar action taken, that had the same effect in the case of drought areas on certain crops under the soil bank last year—in the case of corn for instance? I think where the drought had hit those areas they were allowed to put these crops under the soil bank at that time, were they not?

Mr. POAGE. Of course our committee has heard a great deal of testimony as to the effect of the soil bank in the corn areas last year. It seems to me that the result was to pay some \$179,000,000 of money to those people but not to do what the soil bank was expected to do—that is this payment did not reduce the corn crop. But this is not a bill that is going to enrich a group of people as those payments did but it is a bill that is going to encourage a group of people to keep from further abusing the soil that is about to lose its turf. I do not think the soil bank payments to corn farmers last year had that result. They simply put money in the people's pockets. This bill is to protect the Nation's soil. It offers the only practicable method of doing so in this area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Further, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the provisions of this bill are flexible, are they not, and a county not now in a drought area, should it become designated a drought area, can be included under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. Any area that becomes a drought disaster area can be placed under the provisions of this bill by the Secretary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not that circumscribed somewhat in that grazing must be the chief source of income in that area?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. The bill relates only to grazing land.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In other words, the drought county that has some farming and some grazing might not come under the provisions of the bill even though it is a total drought area.

Mr. POAGE. The Secretary would have the discretion to determine whether there was enough grazing involved to justify the imposition of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Secretary also determine when the deferred grazing period shall end?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, with this one exception: The bill provides that he cannot make the period for less than 12 months, and the reason was that the committee felt it was so plain it would be an utter waste of money to make payments for a period less than 12 months. Where grazing is deferred for less than a full year there would not be a chance of letting the grass reseed. We provided that the minimum must be 12 months.

Mr. GROSS. And it is left to someone's discretion to open it again after it recovers?

Mr. POAGE. I think we are faced with this situation in all the eastern edges of the drought area, let us say on the perimeter of the drought area, but I am more familiar with the eastern edge of that perimeter than any other. In that area you will find that the Secretary will probably need only 1-year contracts because probably 1 year's deferment is all that land will need for recovery. Where it is a little more severely damaged he will probably give 2-year contracts, feeling that 1 year will not cure the situation; and in the most severe portions he undoubtedly will give 3-year contracts, and that is as far as he can go under the terms of this bill. There are undoubtedly areas in which he will give 3-year contracts. The bill gives him discretion between 1, 2, and 3-year periods.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether the bill as worded would help our Missouri counties.

Mr. POAGE. Not unless the Secretary of Agriculture decides that the Missouri counties are a disaster area. I know there is much discussion about that matter. From all I have heard, conditions particularly in the western and southwestern counties of Missouri are desperate, but to date the Department of Agriculture has not declared those counties to be a portion of the disaster area.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But this would be an enabling act which should benefit the situation in those counties.

Mr. POAGE. The minute the Secretary decides that they are disaster counties the terms of this bill are as applicable there as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just suggest from reading page 2 of the bill that that again is circumscribed by the language in which grazing is decided to be a substantial factor in agricultural production.

Mr. POAGE. Right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the gentleman will yield for 1 further question, I refer to lines 22 to 24:

Payment to any person for deferred grazing of land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000 in any one year.

There are large landowners who own land in 2, 3, or 4 counties. Would that language mean that he could get up to \$5,000 in each county where he happened to have land located?

Mr. POAGE. It does, because there are probably not more than three dozen such owners in the whole United States. In discussing the administration of the act we felt that it would be extremely complex to require every contract to be sent back to Washington to have it checked against every other county in the United States. The administration of this thing would increase in cost far more than the amount you could save by not making those few payments than if we had taken the other approach and tried to say that if you had more than \$5,000 anywhere in the United States you are ineligible. This program is to be operated on a county basis, as the gentleman knows.

It is handled through the county offices. Smith County does not know what the record is in Jones County. There is no way of knowing it for the 3,000 counties of the United States except to send every contract to Washington and have every contract audited here. The cost of that would be out of proportion to the savings.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be possible for an individual owning land in several counties to get \$5,000 for each county.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Is this an outright grant or loan?

Mr. POAGE. It is neither a grant or a loan. It is a direct payment for performing a service to the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is like burying the potatoes in the ground?

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think it is like burying potatoes in the ground for this reason. When you bury potatoes, you destroy them. This bill prevents the destruction of the grass. I do not think the gentleman understands the situation in the Southwest.

Mr. O'NEILL. We have had tornadoes up in the northeast section, we have had hurricanes in the northeast section,

we have had floods up in the northeast section. The people in our section of the country have suffered as much in the past 2 years as you have in Texas, and we feel sorry for you. But we do not come in here and ask for handouts. We had a bill up here last year but you people from Texas put a crippling amendment on that bill so that it would not work. We of Massachusetts, we in the northeast section, had to work out our own problems. You people down there with your oil wells, why not work out your own problems without coming to the Congress and saddling the expense on the people of the entire United States.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, it is not the same people who have the oil wells that have these little ranches. They are entirely different people. It is for the very reason the gentleman has discussed that we have put a \$5,000 limitation in here. That was placed there, in part at least, so that the benefits of this bill will not go to the people who do not need it. We understand that there are people in Texas who do not need any help to defer their pastures, just as there are people in Boston who do not need the hundred-million-dollar subsidy contained in the insurance bill we gave New England a year or two ago, but I do not recall that the gentlemen offered to make them ineligible for those benefits. Where there is one man in Texas who has made money out of oil, there are about 3,500 who have never made a thin dime on oil. Those people are in just as dire circumstances as they would be if there were not somebody from Dallas or Houston who had made a bunch of money out of oil.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is a local problem and it should be handled on a local basis by the State.

Mr. POAGE. It is not a local problem. This is involving the life of America itself, and all of America.

Mr. O'NEILL. Oklahoma is also a great wealthy oil State. You were in here last year or the year before for your tidelands and things of that nature. But whenever you have a problem like this you come to the people of the entire Nation and ask them to save you.

Mr. POAGE. This is a problem that relates to the preservation of the soil of America. In every State, in every county, where the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he be the present Secretary or some other man, finds that there is a danger of losing your soil, this applies. History teaches us that vast areas of this world have been overgrazed and have passed from productive pastures into barren deserts which today support no one.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am wondering, Does this bill cover only emergencies of a drought nature or does it cover any kind of emergency situation?

Mr. POAGE. It is only applicable to drought cases. We had a tornado in my hometown which killed 113 people but that did not mean we had to keep cattle off the pastures next year. It is only applicable to drought because drought is



the only kind of disaster that makes it necessary to lighten your livestock load on your pastures.

Mr. McGOVERN. What about provision for a drought in a county where the entire county is not declared eligible for drought relief, where you have spotty damage covering one or more farms in that county?

Mr. FOAGE. If the Secretary of Agriculture declares it to be a disaster area the bill applies whether he declares a large or small area. But that discretion is with the Secretary under existing law and it is not changed by this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. Hearings were held on the bill. I would like to have heard more witnesses or more definite statements from the department as to their attitude on the bill, but those were not forthcoming at that time. However, the committee felt that this was an emergency matter that should be dealt with very promptly so that a beginning could be made in the consideration of this important bill.

I will not go into the merits of the bill. One section dealing with protein feeds was stricken out of the bill, so all that remains in the legislation is the matter dealing with deferred grazing. If the bill works out in actual practice in accordance with the intent of the author of the bill, it should be a good measure and do some good in creating better pasturage in the southwest area wherever there is need for this kind of a policy.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Was Secretary Benson called in on this piece of legislation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Secretary Benson did not appear.

Mr. O'NEILL. Did he send any communications?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not have it, but I understand there was an exchange of letters. Undoubtedly his objections will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that legislation like this would come before the Congress without a recommendation or nonrecommendation from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say in answer to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts that Secretary Benson has sent a letter up here, and he is opposed to the measure as it now stands.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask two questions. First, as to the application of this bill, does it apply to Government-owned lands?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that it does not apply to Government-owned lands.

Mr. BATES. Is that the situation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. BATES. The next question I had was this: If the fishermen up in my area decide not to fish any more because the fish are becoming depleted, is that not the same situation that you have here? The farmers are stopping farming so that they can restore the land; therefore, do you believe the fishing industry should get a subsidy along the same lines as are the farmers in this particular bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In reply to that question, I find that several years ago in your area the fishermen reduced the size of the catch in order to raise the price; that is, on codfish.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman does not understand the situation at all, because that is not the case.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I like to fish, just like my colleague from Michigan does, but I do recall one instance, and I talked with some of the fishermen and they told me that they were going to reduce the size of the catch in order to raise the price.

Mr. BATES. I enjoy the comments of the gentleman, but I would like to get an answer to my question. Would the gentleman tell me specifically what is the difference between a fisherman stopping fishing and a farmer stopping farming? Why should not the fisherman get a subsidy as well as the farmer in this particular case? What is the difference?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a lot of difference, but we will not have time to go into that argument now.

Mr. BATES. The point is, we never do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, we have argued that a great many times here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To answer the question of my very, very dear friend from Massachusetts, it was only a few years ago that we did make an appropriation to teach them how to be experts to catch more fish. Do you remember that one?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman recalls the authorization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you not get the money?

Mr. BATES. We never got the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, that was a dirty trick.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be in the Hall when the debate first started. First of all, this is no laughing or funny matter.

If you lived on the eastern plains of Colorado, in my own district, or in the district of Mr. CHENOWETH; or if you lived in the Panhandle of Texas or on the plains of Oklahoma, you would realize what it means to see your cows without sufficient feed so that they are not

even strong enough to get up without the help of the farmer, and you would then begin to realize that what we are trying to do in this bill is not funny business in any sense.

Really and truly, I was completely surprised when I found that the Department was opposed to this bill. I had no idea that they were going to oppose it and only knew about it after seeing a news item in the paper.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this morning there was mentioned the attitude of the Department of Agriculture toward this measure. But in the final analysis is it not the Congress which should legislate? I believe the gentleman certainly would answer "Yes" to that. Furthermore, I would much rather have the opinion of the membership of the great legislative Committee on Agriculture than I would that of the top echelon of the Department of Agriculture today.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I am glad to get the gentleman's opinion. But we must work together on agriculture. That is why we have a Department of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to some of the provisions in the bill that I think take care of many objections that might be made. First of all it refers to pasture land that has been used as pasture. Would you tell me how anyone can get into the program that has 10,000 or 15,000 acres that have not been used as pasture? He cannot.

The second thing is that this land—and I hope someone will correct me if I am wrong—if a cattle producer or a livestock grower has not been using this land, he cannot get in under this program. There is no way for him to get in under the program.

Also, if he does get into the program, \$5,000 is the most that he can receive at any one time or in any one year. Furthermore, he must agree to follow out the program for a full year. It is only a 3-year program. There is no reason why the House should not pass this bill and send it over into the other body where changes can be made and, of course, will be offered. Then the House can agree or disagree at its pleasure. If there are any provisions in the bill anyone does not like, it is certainly his privilege to raise objections to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in perfect sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but I am wondering how we are going to police it. Most of this land in the southwest counties, in the various States are not pasture. There would have to be some policing. There would be some farmers who would not go into the program. They would have a right to run their cattle out. There are no fences there. I hope we are not going to have to have a Government bureaucrat on every section of land to make sure that the cattle are not getting off onto the wrong section.

I am sure the gentleman can see the problem of policing this. I am wondering if we are not opening up a Pandora's box here, or whether there is no bottom to the pit.

There was a question raised here concerning the State of South Dakota and Idaho having no counties that would come under this program; also there are counties in my State that apparently would be precluded from being in the program. Perhaps some of those counties do not use the land for grazing all the time; that is, not all of the counties, but grazing is the main activity. As I understand it, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and other States where they do have grazing would not even come under the program.

Mr. HILL. Of course, No. 1: This is the same old jinx that follows every bill concerning the farmer. When a farmer wants some assistance they always say you cannot police it. Let me say a word about that. I should like to see you police the traffic in the city of Washington, but you do not remove your traffic officers and repeal your traffic laws because you cannot police the traffic.

As far as policing is concerned, most of our agricultural programs are policed at home in the localities, in the counties where the projects originate. You have the same thing in various types of cultivation of certain crops that are planted to increase the quality of your soil. They are all policed at home at the local level.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I see nothing in the report about the ultimate cost of this program. That certainly must have come up before the committee. What would be the anticipated final cost?

Mr. HILL. I think the author of the bill has an idea of how much money it will cost, but it is a little hard to tell how many acres will be participating. I do not assume there are going to be millions and millions of acres. I think if you want to help the small farmer, you will get the small farmer with the small herd in the small area where he runs the cattle, in on this program.

Mr. O'NEILL. We all have sympathy for the farmers to whom the gentleman refers, but how much is this program going to cost?

Mr. POAGE. No one can tell what the participation will be, but I think we can all agree that it certainly would be not as much as 18 or 20 million in this program. I think it would be very remarkable if you got that much. The program will probably cost an average of \$1.25 an acre. Nobody knows how much you can get, but I think if you can get 20 million acres you will be exceeding everybody's wildest expectations.

Mr. O'NEILL. You certainly must have come up with some idea of what would have to be appropriated.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly I came up with the thought that we would have at the outside 18 or 20 million acres. That is the thought. It may not be correct.

Mr. O'NEILL. Then the gentleman figures it will cost around \$20 or \$25 million?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In the committee it was discussed as being between \$15 and \$25 million, but in my opinion you will not get that much participation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If no one seems able to tell us approximately how much it will cost, can you do it some way by comparison? Will it cost as much as the foreign-aid program would cost?

Mr. HILL. I cannot compare it with foreign aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean it is not as much, or is it more?

Mr. HILL. Let us say not as much. The gentleman can answer his own question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not have asked it if I could have answered it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The question was raised about the fairness of this program to the farmers who do not graze. Were they not put into the soil-bank program last year? Both in and out of drought areas are farmers not eligible to receive not only the rental but the profits they would have received if they had raised a successful crop on land that they put into the soil bank?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. Our entire soil-bank program is in the formative stage. There is no reason in the world why you should not take pasture and submarginal land and put it in the conservation part of the soil-bank program.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Is it not a fact that the bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to prescribe the terms and conditions on which this is granted, and that would mean the authority to require the States to match this money if he so desired?

Mr. HILL. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, because I neglected to read this section. I am reading from section 3, which is the key to the whole bill:

The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.

Under that clause the Secretary can set up local committees, and the farmers or stockmen that came into the program would be absolutely bound voluntarily to follow the rules and regulations adopted by the Department of Agriculture. I say under that section the cities and the municipalities and the counties and the States could all cooperate. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thought that this bill had been pretty thoroughly argued out and that everyone understood it. I am a little regretful that there has been some play of words here about one part of the country getting more than some other part of the country. I think I have about as good a sense of humor as anyone in the House of Representatives, but I want you to know it is a pretty serious situation, so serious that it is something that cannot be played with either with words or with lack of action. In regard to the Secretary of Agriculture, I remarked here on the floor the other day, I do not think the democratic form of Government, under which we are conducting the affairs of this country, sets up any provision where the Secretary of Agriculture can veto something that the representatives of the people who are sent here to legislate provide to be included among our laws. This law is nothing in the world but good, sound commonsense in regard to soil conservation. I had hoped that the provisions similar to those contained in this bill would have been included in the soil-bank provisions. And they would have been had Mr. ALBERT's amendment been adopted when the soil-bank program was before the House. But, although the House did see fit to adopt it, the other body struck it. One of the reasons, let me say, I think, was because the Secretary of Agriculture at that time said he did not want to mix up the soil-bank program with anything in the world that might help out drought relief, for the simple reason that he wanted the soil bank devoted solely to the reduction of surpluses, and not to help anybody out who was affected by the drought. All right, well and good. The Congress did just exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture said he wanted on that; although I voted for the Albert amendment then, and I am going to vote for this bill today.

What we have done is to come back to the Congress with a soil conservation measure that is designed to provide drought relief that will protect the soil of this Nation. It has been remarked here on the floor today that this is not a national problem. I appreciate the concern of my friends from the Northeast. I want to say I have helped them out many times on these measures and I will continue to do so in the future. But, this is definitely a national problem because if I could take you today to my district, which is in the geographical center of this drought area, and show you how the land has deteriorated, many of you would not believe it. In one section, our grass has been eaten off by the cattle and the top soil has been removed by the winds clear down to the hardpan. It is going to take 5 years to reseed that and to grow that back. And that is a minimum estimate of the time that it will take. In addition to that plague, in one section of my district we were hit by a plague that I am sure some of you have never heard of, a plague of grass termites. They came in under the



grass and ate the roots of the grass. When the cattle eat that grass, they lift out the whole tuft of grass and nothing in the world but the hardpan is left. It looks just exactly like the bare spots on a baseball diamond between bases where the runner runs. If we do not do something to relieve that situation and afford some temporary relief to these people who are making a living off that land, there is nothing in the world for them to do but to move to the metropolitan areas. I think we, in all fairness to everyone concerned, should give at least fair consideration to this matter and understand what this bill does. My friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has explained to you exactly what it is intended to do. It is not intended to grant anybody anything. It is intended to provide a means to let these people keep their heads above the waters of the economic sea. That is what it is designed to do. Unless something is provided, the 6 years of the drought that we have already had, and we got another one this year, is going to engulf a lot of them and you are going to have a lot of the little ranchers move off the land and then you will be in a worse situation than you have ever dreamed of.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made as to the real and grave necessity behind this legislation and for calling attention to the national implications involved in this Dust Bowl problem if something is not done to check it. The folks who live in the metropolitan areas or in areas far removed from the Dust Bowl may be a year or two later than the folks who live in the dust bowl in feeling the implications of what happens down there. But they will feel them as certainly as the sun rises in the morning, if we do not do something to check it. I think the gentleman has made a strong point in calling the attention of the Members to the national implications of this Dust Bowl problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is one other thing I want to say about the national situation. You remember back in the depression days this Government in many instances, because people had overgrazed land and overplanted land, had to buy up submarginal land. That land the Government has been restoring all along, and much of it has been brought back to production. If we pass legislation of this kind we will afford an opportunity to the landowner, the person living on the land, to restore that land. Otherwise, you let it go into worse condition, and then the next thing we will be back in submarginal land-buying program by the Government.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Oklahoma that if we could

get rid of this tax-depletion exemption on oil those States will be able to handle the situation very easily.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Surely, the gentleman must be joking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the questions that have been asked, I think it is proper that the position of the Department of Agriculture should be known.

First, I want to say that they are opposed to the passage of this legislation in its present form. They think it would create as many problems as it would solve.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the statement of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### DEFERRED GRAZING BILL, H. R. 2367

The Department of Agriculture vigorously opposes the passage of H. R. 2367. Administration of the bill as it is written would be nearly impossible, and at best, would create more problems than the bill could solve. These problems include:

1. Much of the rangeland involved is not fenced and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce regulations setting aside a given number of acres out of an unfenced range.

2. The withdrawing of a substantial acreage of rangeland would bring about additional hardships, since there is not enough grazing land now with all the available range being grazed.

3. If an actual reduction of grazing lands could be accomplished it would be followed by a liquidation of cattle and sheep which would be disastrous to market prices.

4. The Department recognizes the critical problem faced by some livestock men, but H. R. 2367 is so written as to provide payments indiscriminately and without regard to need. The result would be that much of the funds provided would go into the pockets of wealthy cattlemen and absentee landowners, instead of helping the cattleman who is in real trouble.

5. The language of the bill leaves serious question as to whether payments under the deferred grazing program would be authorized for ranchers and farmers on federally owned grazing land as well as to those on privately owned grazing land. Neither is it clear whether the bill is intended to apply to land which is not now used for grazing, but which may have been so used in the past.

6. The bill does not provide for any State participation and the Department feels that abuses of such programs using the taxpayers' money can largely be avoided if the State will contribute a reasonable share of the cost of the program.

7. The bill would not only be difficult to administer because of the reasons noted above, but it does not provide authority of a regulatory nature other than the withholding of payment or the recovery of payment already made in the event the program provisions are violated. This would tend to encourage violations, the Department believes, under the reasoning that even if the claimant is found in violation the worst the Gov-

ernment can do is to take the payment away from him without any additional penalty.

8. Such a program as this bill provides moves in the direction of Government regulation and control of the livestock industry.

9. The scope of the program is so large that 40 to 50 million acres may be involved with a cost of \$40 million estimated. In view of the magnitude of the program, it seems unreasonable that the sponsors of the bill did not ask for a formal report from the Department of Agriculture, did not invite representatives of national farm organizations to testify, nor did representatives of national livestock associations present their views. Some of these associations have already gone on record with resolutions opposing the principles embodied in H. R. 2367.

10. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior have recently made a survey of the drought area and a conference was held in Wichita to hear the recommendations of those closest to the problem. These recommendations have been further refined by the 190 representatives from 15 drought States who took part in the Wichita meeting, and their suggestions are now being received by the Department of Agriculture. It does not seem reasonable that these men who gave their time and energies in an effort to secure good drought legislation should be denied a voice in this matter, or that legislation should be hastily adopted before their recommendations can be heard.

11. The establishment of equitable payment rates will present serious problems because of the lack of completely adequate data. State averages cannot be assumed to be the same as the true rental value in every case, but due to selective participation, might be considerably more or less.

In brief, the Department has serious doubts that this bill, as written, could be administered even if enacted. We do not believe that it will do what it purports to do, and we believe that it would produce more problems than it solves in the drought-stricken areas.

We are deeply sympathetic to the problem facing our farmers and ranchers, and we expect to have complete and workable drought recommendations ready soon which will embody the recommendations made by those in drought areas. It would be hasty and ill-considered, however, to take action without hearing the livestock groups who will be most affected, the conferees at Wichita and major farm organizations.

The argument that the House can enact this bill and then leave it to the Senate or a conference committee to clean it up is hardly a sound legislative proposal.

Furthermore, the present broad drought program is working effectively.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Department is not opposing this bill here today, because it hopes a satisfactory bill can be secured in the Senate.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, there you have heard the situation with that letter. If anybody was ever looking for an out that is certainly it. A lot of us from the great industrial States probably want to take it, but I am not going to. I have been voting for farm legislation since 1944, and so have many of my colleagues from the great industrial States.

There is before this body and there is before the Committee on Banking and Currency my bill to aid distressed economic areas in this Nation. It affects 25 or 35 entire congressional districts in more than a dozen States. Similar legislation was recommended by the Presi-

dent 2 years in a row; it is in the platform of both great political parties.

Many of the Members on both sides of the aisle from these farming and rural States if given half a chance have indicated they will be against that kind of law. Now, Mr. Chairman, if ever there was special pleading the farm legislation is it. I voted for subsidies; I voted for a library of law for the farming districts, and for my colleagues from farming sections at their request for years. We have given you subsidies for everything but the squeal of your hogs, and I suppose you will soon get that; you are entitled to most of this because in the rest of the States we have got to eat and if you do not produce we do not eat.

But there are other national problems that go beyond the farm problem. While your cause is a sacred cow to the politicians of both parties, I speak, Mr. Chairman, of other serious economic problems that are equally serious affecting dozens of millions of people throughout this Nation, and when my bill is before the Committee and the House I plead for your support. Remember today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the statement was made that the Secretary of Agriculture is now opposed to this bill. I am sure that that correctly reflects the Secretary's position as of 1:45 this afternoon. But the Secretary of Agriculture did not express this opposition to the Agriculture Committee of this House. On the 17th day of last month the committee called upon the Department of Agriculture for its suggestions and advice on this matter. The Department of Agriculture sent the head of the drought division, Mr. Kenneth Scott, to testify before our committee. Every bit of this record of 75 pages is Mr. Kenneth Scott's testimony and it does not say that the Department is opposed to the bill. He was asked if the Department opposed the bill, but he did not answer either yea or nay.

Most of the objections that were just read to the House today were never presented to the Committee on Agriculture. Three or four of them were presented, were considered, and were answered. The letter which was just read did not state to whom these questions were addressed. They were not addressed to the Committee on Agriculture of the House nor have they ever been presented. They were not addressed to the Speaker of the House.

In addition to Mr. Scott's testimony, Under Secretary True D. Morse was before the committee and every page of this record is Mr. Morse's testimony about this bill. He did not present the objections that have been raised this afternoon.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the Secretary probably was going to give that information through the Washington Post as he has done in connection with some of the other matters or messages. It seems that he prefers to do

that rather than to give them direct to our committees.

Mr. POAGE. I think so. The Secretary raised certain questions here today through the minority leader. He asks, How are you going to take care of land if it is not fenced? Well, most of this is fenced. The day of the free range is gone except in connection with Government land and this program does not involve Government land. Surely the Government can and will protect its own land from abuse. As to individuals, they can do their own fencing or leave it undone. If a rancher has but one pasture he would have to put all his land in the program. If he wanted to put in only a part of his land he would have to build cross fences.

The Secretary fears that we are going to reduce the cattle population. Could there be a finer thing happen to the livestock industry than to reduce the cattle population of America? I think that everybody except the packers will agree that we have several million too many cattle.

In other words, he feels that the program is not going to be too effective. I do not think it is going to be very effective so far as reducing the cattle population is concerned. But to the extent it does reduce the cattle population it will be a double blessing. For every head it does reduce our cattle population that is to the advantage of every livestock grower in the country, whether he produces cattle, sheep, or hogs. It is certainly to the advantage of America to strengthen our livestock market.

The Secretary suggests that certain wealthy cattlemen would get most of this money. Obviously he has not read the provisions of the bill that limits payment to \$5,000. This denies many middle-sized-ranch men an opportunity to participate. Surely no one would want to make the bill any more restrictive.

The Secretary objects because the States are not required to participate in this program. I want to make it plain that I think one of my colleagues was in error when he said that the States do participate in the cost of this program. The Secretary is correct in saying that it does not provide for State participation any more than the present deferred-grazing program that we have had for the last 16 years so provides. Why should we require the desperately hurt States to pay part of a program to save the soil when the Federal Government pays all of the cost in other States, as it now does?

This leads me to the last important criticism. For 20 years the Department of Agriculture has administered grazing programs and it has had a very substantial participation. It has had as high as 35,000 farms some years and that program was, and is, applicable all over the United States. The Secretary has found no difficulty in administering it. This program is no more difficult to administer than the present deferred-grazing phase of the soil-conservation program that has been administered for 20 long years.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that the final objection of the Secretary that it would not work was exactly the same objection he made to the soil-bank proposition when it was first proposed to him, at which time he said the soil bank would not work?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. The Secretary will embrace this program just as he has heretofore embraced that program; the Secretary will support this; the Secretary will go to the other body and suggest that there are certain little amendments which he considers vital. It will then become the Benson program, and he will tell the country that it is a good program. I do not care whose name is to it. I simply want to see us save the soil of America.

No one has come here and made any practical suggestion as to how this soil could be saved other than by a program of deferred grazing. As far as I know, the soil-conservation people of this and of no other nation have found no other program to protect the turf. It must be done, else we will be spending many times this amount to reseed that self-same land. It costs \$20 to \$50 an acre to reseed it. It may cost us as much as \$3 an acre over a period of time to save it under this program. I think we would be most unwise to refuse to take this needed step, just because the Department did not think about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. It appears to me, even though there be some subsidy in the bill, that subsidies have been established since George Washington's time and that subsidies are fundamentally American.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, very few Members of this body are so young that they do not recall the days of the Dust Bowl. It was caused by failure to keep some degree of cover on drought-parched lands in the Middle West and Southwest.

What the Members may not realize is that we are now facing another Dust Bowl, some of it in the same area as that which occurred some 20 years ago.

Granting that we are now to have somewhere near adequate rainfall in the drought areas, we still face the necessity for reseeding and resodding the drought-parched areas. Even though the grass may start to grow back, when the summer sun begins to parch it again this coming summer the roots will have difficulty finding any moisture in the subsoil; and the sod poorly established, at best, will have a hard time sustaining itself through even a normal summer.

If cattle have been permitted to graze the new grass as fast as it appears, there will be no reseeding process and the resodding will not take place. Therefore, the cattle must be kept off until there has been sufficient rainfall and until sufficient time has passed, even though it



be 2 or 3 years, for the sod to be thoroughly reestablished.

In the meantime, the cattlemen who would normally put their stock on these pastures remain in the precarious economic condition they now find themselves. The modest rental payments proposed in this bill provide the best means which the committee has been able to find for keeping the cattlemen and their creditors in a reasonably solvent condition. We face a disaster which could seriously impair the Nation's economy, not alone that in the affected areas.

Let me stress to you that the cautious, almost fearful attitude of the Department of Agriculture will not get this job done. It will take bold and determined steps and it will take immediate action and not reluctant and hesitant measures after long delays. This legislation may not be perfect, but at least it is an effort and one which the drought victims certainly deserve at the hands of the Congress.

I urge the passage of the bill as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

#### PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on Rules has reported out several resolutions granting investigative authority to several committees of the House. They will be brought up tomorrow, and are as follows:

House Resolution 139, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

House Resolution 29, Committee on Foreign Affairs;

House Resolution 113, Committee on Public Works;

House Resolution 65, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

House Resolution 128, authorizing the Committee on House Administration to continue investigation of Government printing; and

H. R. 1056, the military substandard housing bill.

I understand there is no controversy over them, and with the conclusion of these matters tomorrow, then the understanding between the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself with reference to next week will be applicable.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program shall

be applicable only to land which is normally used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land. Such program in any county shall be made available to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain available for a period of not less than 3 years after the termination of such county as a major disaster area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill in committee we were advised that the President was going to send to the Congress his recommendations for dealing with the drought situation. Now, everyone is aware that some 3 or 4 weeks ago the President went to the drought area along with the Secretary of Agriculture and others. Since that time more than 3 weeks have passed and yet we have not received any recommendations from either the Department or the President dealing with this proposition. Meanwhile the drought continues on the Great Plains of this country with increasing severity. Today the Department still complains that we should await the recommendations of the administration.

This reminds me of an incident that took place in my community when I was a small boy in southeastern Oklahoma—when a Government survey team was surveying that part of the country. One of the young engineers had a team of Government mules, one of which was severely injured when the tongue of a wagon pierced its stomach. The engineer's first reaction was to shoot the suffering mule, but after thinking it over, he thought to himself, "This is a Government animal. If I shoot the mule, I will probably have to pay for it." So he wired his superintendent for authority to kill the mule. The superintendent wired back and said that he had sent his request to the regional office with the recommendation that it be approved. Within a few days the mule died. A couple of weeks later the answer came back from the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., saying: "Dear sir, your request, forwarded to the superintendent and by him forwarded to the regional office, who in turn referred it to this Department, has been considered by the appropriate agency, and after due consideration you are directed to proceed immediately and shoot the mule." If we delay this matter until we have heard from the administration it may be too late to do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, is he?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I am not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, but I am comparing the suffering in the drought-stricken area to the suffering that the mule experienced.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the gentlemen on the

Democratic side should object to giving a little time for consideration of this situation by the President. He made a special trip to the area. Just a few days ago they told him to go ahead and use the Army at his discretion over there across the ocean, did they not? What is so fussy about this? Why not wait until the President comes up with his considered solution?

I can understand why this bill is important. It gives these Texas gentlemen—but before I go into that, I would like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of the debate here today if there are any oil wells on this grazing land? That question is asked in all seriousness. As to this land which is to be subsidized, are there any oil wells on it?

Great silence over there. No answer. Texas is one of the richest States in the Union. There is more money down there apparently than in most other States. They have had a rapid growth in population and in wealth and they are making improvements all the time all along the way. They have shown they are amply able to handle their own State problems. This year they made a wonderful advance when they voted for Eisenhower. They are really going somewhere.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I am wondering if some of those oil wells might not be shut down, because I understand the price of gas is going up, that some of the production is being held down so that they may increase the price to the consumer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is due to this situation over around Suez, the canal being clogged up and the line of supply shut off, so that you and I and the rest of the people who use gasoline and oil are to pay a little more for it. So they will profit that way. Less oil, perhaps, but a higher price. There will not be any net loss to them down there.

This bill is important because it affords an opportunity to some to show the interested parties they are on the job.

Some of us have had Dust Bowl legislation brought before us in others years. Do you remember that? I have been reading some of these Westerns and apparently the situation has always revolved around a contest between the grazing boys, the people who want to raise cattle, and the fellows who want to farm, between the ranchers and the sod busters. Unless I am very much mistaken, what happened in the years gone by has been this. A breaking up by plowing or grazing of sod which has been followed by a blowing away of good soil. We are told now that the grazing was so close that the cattle ate all the top off the grass and the roots became so loose that now we must pay subsidies to reseed because the roots were blown away when that land was plowed or grazed.

Well, you cannot have it both ways unless periodically the land is reseeded at Government expense. Now, I suppose we are to blame, we in other sections of the country, if we do not remedy their error.

When the water in Lake Michigan and Lake Erie and Lake Huron got high, water let out by Canada which should have gone into Hudson Bay, but was dumped down into Lake Superior, came down through the St. Marys River and finally got into other of the Great Lakes, and washed out the improvements, the homes, docks, and harbors we had in Wisconsin and both sides of Lake Michigan and in some of the other States. Members will remember that we were not given relief even though the fault was not ours. Did they give us any help then? No, no; they would not do that. Now, when you want water over there for your Sanitary Canal, or a little drinking water in Chicago—although I do not know why you would want to drink that stuff—the gentlemen from Chicago are asking for more water from Lake Michigan—but when you want that, the State Department says, "No, you have got to see Canada first; that is an international problem."

Now, with reference to this Dust Bowl. Does the fault not lie with the people who lived there and misused the land? Is that not the reason for the present trouble?

Now they want us to come along and help pay them a subsidy to those who are being injured by a lack of rain and their own way of land use.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman regard it as a misuse of the land to continue to try to make a living if it is the only land a man has and there is no alternative to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just a silly interpretation of my statement. The gentleman is assuming there is no alternative. In my county we have poor, cold sand. We gave up trying to grow crops on it. I consider the misuse of the land is where a fellow goes along and insists on using grazing land for the growing of grain. There is some land that you cannot plow up and have it stay put. When rain fails, the wind blows, it just leaves that area. My Dutch grandfather from Pennsylvania used to rotate his crops. He never kept on plowing it and seeding it year after year. He let sod grow on it once in a while. He sowed wheat one year, had clover the next, and either planted corn or let it lie fallow the next. You plow up land that is not suitable for the growing of grain. You plow it up and seed it, harvest, and sell a crop year after year when the only sensible use is to use it for grazing?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman realize that the land that has been plowed is not eligible for this particular program? What the gentleman is saying may be true, but it does not relate to the matter in issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would not be the first time a Congressman has talked about something that was not relevant, now, would it? However, from what in-

formation I have, knowing that we have rainless seasons or years, folks are using the land just as though they were certain rain would fall as and when needed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us just be fair about this situation. Our country has experienced subsidies since George Washington's time. They are just as American as George Washington was. We started out with the tariff under George Washington, and we have continued it. The American public has spent billions upon billions of dollars supporting the large manufacturers in the East. Believe it or not, I am not opposed to a tariff. I am not opposed to a reasonable tariff at all. I think they are entitled to some protection. I think it gives good security to our whole economy.

In addition, the slick magazines come through the mails and pay almost nothing for that privilege. That is based on the need to disseminate information in this great democracy. We give them practically a free ride, and I am for that, too, as long as it is proper.

Some of you, I think, may be in opposition to this measure. I hope you will not be, but perhaps you just do not understand our problem out there. It is a terrible situation there, by reason of this devastating drought we are going through. The author of this bill is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], one of the soundest and best Members of this Congress, in my judgment, and he has given a lot of thought to it. The great Committee on Agriculture has brought it out.

This is not just a gimmick to give money away, it is a matter to give new life to the soil and the grass that grows on it and to give justice to our people. If you want us to go along with you and support the tariff and other things you may be interested in, we ask your indulgence, for this is a serious situation with us, and we would like for you to help us. When you do, we do not think you are doing any more for us than we are doing for you or are willing to do for you. Let us just be fair. Come on and help us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would be glad to go along with you in preference to going along with these appropriations for other nations, sure, but is there going to be money enough to go around? As I understand, you are bound, or rather, not bound, but you are determined to continue these foreign-aid programs.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman knows that he and I pretty well have agreed on this foreign-aid proposition, as far as I am personally concerned. Some of the other gentlemen do disagree with me on that, and some on the gentleman's side disagree as to that. But that is beside the question here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MORRIS. This is for our own people at home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is only so much money. If you keep on giving it

abroad you cannot give it to the Texas boys.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but let us stay with the bill here. Let us give the people out there an opportunity to live, an opportunity to exist. Let us protect our soil and grass by passing this bill. It is a good bill, I think.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add a few words here from a group of people who have no oil wells—they do not have any fish in any ocean—they cannot benefit directly from this bill at the present time—but we are for this legislation. You see, we cannot yet benefit from this legislation in south Missouri because we have a strange kind of drought. It is an unofficial, off-the-record drought without the benefit of Mr. Benson's official blessings. For some strange reason, we have not been declared a disaster area in spite of the fact that of all the States of the Union, we alone match Texas and Oklahoma for the dubious honor of having the worst pasture conditions in America, 26 percent of normal. We rank fourth worst in the Nation in the matter of hay supplies. Our hay production this year was 72 percent to 80 percent of normal at the outset and it is now almost totally exhausted by an unusually long feeding period that started as early as July and August of this year. Other States with pasture conditions 60 percent of normal and hay supplies 151 percent of normal are receiving disaster aid from the Federal Government. But the Secretary of Agriculture steadfastly refuses to declare southwest Missouri a disaster area. Nevertheless we will not be dogs in the manger. We are for good legislation which is good for America, and we are neither surprised nor impressed to hear that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this bill. It is not the first time that he has tried to thwart the will of the Congress, and I suspect it will not be the last. For instance, it might have escaped your notice, but here is an excellent example. Public Law 875, which was passed by the 81st Congress, specifically states that "the President through the Secretary of Agriculture shall furnish to established farmers, ranchers, and stockmen feed for livestock"—and get this—"and seed for planting."

The sad truth is that in spite of the fact that the language is clear, the Secretary of Agriculture has never provided any seed to any drought disaster areas. Not one dime of additional money has ever been allocated through the ACP to counties suffering from drought so that farmers might reseed their ravaged pastures. The excuse is that the Government has no stockpile of surplus seed. But, I submit that excuse is too thin to pour. The Government owns no Commodity Credit Corporation surplus of hay either, but it has and is providing hay in many drought-stricken States. The mere fact that the Government has no surplus seed should not preclude the benefit that was intended by the Congress. One of the most important needs in any disaster area is to get some grass or permanent pasture back on the fields.



That was the intent of Congress or it would never have so stated in Public Law 875. But, because Mr. Benson has no surplus seed, the will of the Congress is thwarted. I quote from a conversation that I had just this morning with one Mr. Fred G. Ritchie of the Agricultural Conservation Service Program who said:

The only additional funds that have been allocated over and above the regular conservation program has been for wind erosion and flood damage area. The department has not allocated additional funds under ACSP for drought practices.

So you see while it is on the books, while it is definitely the will of Congress, we apparently have not spelled it out sufficiently for the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress has tried. We have told them they should provide seed for reseeding. In fact, just yesterday we voted the money for it.

May I quote from page 3 under the "Disaster-loan revolving fund," which we voted yesterday as a deficiency appropriation, "\$15 million that may be used for emergency feed and seed assistance." Note the word "seed" appears again in our drought legislation.

We want it done. We have appropriated the money, but the Department of Agriculture refuses to do it.

I had hoped to present an amendment to this legislation today which will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal aid for the reseeding of permanent pasture. But after talking with the Committee on Agriculture I believe it would be better to present a special bill—which I will do at an early date—a bill which will spell out in no uncertain terms that the will of Congress is that the Government is to provide specific aid in the reseeding of permanent pasture and other vegetation in drought-stricken areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the time of Mr. BROWN of Missouri was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I will present that bill, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture will give it prompt action, because it is already the specific will of Congress and has been so stated many times.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas whom we respect as a learned friend of agriculture.

Mr. FOAGE. The committee will be glad to have the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I want to say a word about deferred grazing. Every person in this room is vitally concerned with the goal that will be accomplished by this measure and subsequent measures of drought assistance.

There can be pros and cons on whether a government has certain responsibilities in time of emergency to aid in the development of the sands of Arabia or Pakistan. There can be pros and cons on government's right to assume other

responsibilities now taken for granted by governments all over the world.

But here we are talking about a time-honored government responsibility that is as old as government itself. Historically, even among the least civilized tribes, governments have come to the aid of their unfortunate citizens who suffer an act-of-God disaster.

And I do not care how modern we have become, or how much our concepts have changed. If this Government has so many commitments that it cannot extend a helping hand to those who are stricken by disaster, this Government has too many commitments.

But even more important than the good-neighbor principle involved in this legislation, let me point out to you that everyone in this Hall can vote for this bill out of sheer selfishness, if need be.

Everyone—in every congressional district—eats food; and every housewife I have ever seen is vitally interested in the lowest possible grocery bill every month. Now, this legislation deals with the vital source of both.

We are talking about the heart of the modern diet and the heart of economical grocery bills; because we are talking about protecting the most economical source of meat and milk. That is what we are eating in the 20th century. Not homemade bread or biscuits or lard anymore. We are eating meat, milk, and eggs.

And if we are to assure ourselves ever-increasing supplies of beef and milk; if the housewife is to continue to buy these supplies at the most economical price—we must protect nature's own way of producing meat and milk. We must keep grass on the grass farms of America. For to replace nature's grass with man-grown and harvested roughage is to increase every grocery bill in America.

The blue-stem plains of Oklahoma, Texas, and the West—and the woodland pastures of southwest Missouri—have been ravaged by an undramatic but horrible disaster. Not just one drought. Not just two. But 4 and 5 in a row.

America cannot afford to lose the meat and milk production of this area. For this is the source of economical production.

The bottom farms of the creek valleys and the deltas—the irrigated farms of the great reclamation areas—can produce crops more economically than the plains or upland farms. But no one, and Mr. Chairman, I mean no one, can produce meat and milk more economically than our grass farmers, who farm the low-priced thin land of America.

You cannot graze cattle or milk cows on \$300 an acre land, unless you want to pay \$3 a pound for a porterhouse steak and 50 cents a quart for milk. We must protect nature's grass.

After continuous droughts, our grass-farms are going. Some are as bare as this tabletop. Our farmers have seeded and reseeded, straining their pocket-books and their credit, hoping against hope that next year the rains will come. But the rains have not come; and our farmers cannot dig into their jeans for another gamble.

The only way that we, as Americans, can keep grass on the grass farms is for

all of us, through our Government, to make it economically feasible for the owner or renter to defer grazing and reseed his parched fields. That is what this legislation is designed to do.

Now this bill as it stands is directed primarily toward ranching; and this is just the first of many drought measures. Other will be brought forth which will mean more specific benefits for the small farmer who produces meat and milk.

But the principle of deferred grazing is sound. It is no money-making gimmick. By the time the Department of Agriculture carves this thing up to fit the money, the deferred-grazing payments will scarcely be enough to replace the income the ranchers could have gained by keeping cattle on even the ravaged acres.

But it will offer the farmer who looks toward the future some economic justification for sacrificing today's "bird in the hand" for tomorrow's "two in the bush." He will not make any money out of the deal. But if it is properly administered, maybe he will not lose too much; and the Nation will gain the replenishment of land at the very time the land needs it most—immediately after a serious drought.

This one piece of grass-farming legislation is small, indeed, compared to the Government programs for crop farming, especially when you consider that livestock products contribute 55 percent of our total gross agricultural product of the Nation.

The money involved is mere pocket change compared to the costly soil bank.

And few, if any, grass farmers can qualify for soil bank payments. You have to have a base acreage allotment to qualify for soil-bank acreage reserve program. And, even in the conservation reserve, only those acres that have been devoted to soil-depleting crops can be included.

All the grass farmers are asking here is deferred grazing for a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 3 years and only for those areas that have suffered a major disaster.

This legislation is sound. It is sorely needed to insure the continuing supply of vital portions of our daily diet both in the immediate and long-range future. It strives to protect the most economical source of that production: Nature's way, the grass.

The people of south Missouri who have suffered 5 long years of drought and its accompanying disasters—who are even now in the midst of a major disaster, albeit an off-the-record one without benefit of Benson recognition—are proud to join in urging the passage of this bill.

Even if we never get to participate in the program, deferred grazing is good for America.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only 1 minute, simply to clarify the record on 2 or 3 points that have been raised. First: This drought is no respecter of State lines or of county lines. Some 600 counties in the United States are now officially identified by the Secretary of Agriculture as being of disaster propor-

tions. That is one-fifth of all the counties in the United States. It goes all the way from the Mexican border almost to the Canadian border; so it is a nationwide problem to which this bill would apply. The United States Weather Bureau and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey have described the drought conditions as the worst that has beset this country in more than 300 years. It is so serious in its extent that it has been played up in front-page feature stories in practically every national magazine in the country during the last 6 months. Not only that, it was so serious it caused the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in their solicitude for the plight of the people in this area and the land that is going to ruin, to go there recently and spend 3 days studying the problem and inspecting the actual area involved. I was present when the President came to my home county in San Angelo, Tex. There he was told by the best authorities in America—not some local man but by the best authorities in America—speaking from the scientific standpoint, from what has been learned in colleges and in connection with the soil-conservation program generally, in a very well-prepared brief that one of the best remedies to apply to this situation is the very provision set up and authorized in this legislation. So I think it is a sound program. This is not a relief measure for any individual or for any particular group. It is a relief measure for the soil of America in order to get it back to normal productive capacity so that some people, among the most stable people in the whole country, will be able to pay their taxes and get back to a normal life once it starts raining again. That is what this bill is for. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture, after careful study and consideration. Every practical soil conservationist in the country is for it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, the seriousness of the drought situation as it affects my district and the entire drought area and Nation cannot be overemphasized.

As I have stated before, the people in southwest Kansas are not in a state of panic about the future of their farm communities, because they know that their area is subject to weather cycles of several years of dry weather, followed by several years of adequate rainfall. They know that things will get better. However, the severity and length of the present shortage of moisture at a time when farmers have faced rising costs and sliding-scale prices has created an immediate situation that concerns the whole Nation and which I would term a national emergency. Of course, we are concerned as a Nation when those who provide the major portions of our bread and meat are not rewarded in income for

their lifegiving services because of a catastrophe of nature and lower parity prices. But we are also deeply concerned about what may happen to that great natural resource—our native pastureland—in a time of unparalleled drought. Already much grass has been overpastured and is in danger of being lost. Re-seeding in these areas is expensive and often impractical. The bill to establish a deferred grazing program is aimed at making it possible for ranchers to rest these now marginal pastures. Such a practice would help to sustain the present stands of grass and allow it to seed and thicken while farmer-ranchers receive a nominal fee from the Government equal to prevailing rental rates as a temporary measure. If the pastures need to be rested some will wonder why the farmer or rancher does not do this on his own initiative. Many are doing this already. Others, destitute for immediate income, are continuing to pasture, with the hope that rain will be immediately forthcoming and the knowledge that this is their only possibility for any sort of income. This program will be the farthest thing from a plum for its recipients. The payments will be nominal, and the maximum to any one operator is set at \$5,000.

To summarize, this bill, if passed, will serve three purposes. First, it will furnish some of temporary monetary assistance to the drought-stricken areas. Second, it will encourage the kind of protection for one of our great natural resources that individuals in many cases will be unable to provide. Third, deferred grazing practices will make possible increased cover on pasturelands which may avert tremendous wind erosion problems that may otherwise result if the drought continues another year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000 for any 1 year.

Sec. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

Sec. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State extension service which, with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 147, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 110, answered "present" 2, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—269

Abbitt	Anderson,	Ayres
Abernethy	Mont.	Bailey
Adair	Andresen,	Baldwin
Addonizio	August H.	Barden
Albert	Andrews	Baring
Alexander	Anfuso	Bass, Tenn.
Alger	Ashley	Beamer
Allen, III.	Ashmore	Beckworth
Andersen,	Aspinall	Belcher
H. Carl	Avery	Bennett, Fla.



Berry  
Blatnik  
Blitch  
Boggs  
Bolling  
Bonner  
Boykin  
Boyle  
Bray  
Breeding  
Brooks, La.  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Mo.  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cannon  
Carnahan  
Carrigg  
Celler  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chipfield  
Christopher  
Chudoff  
Clark  
Coad  
Coffin  
Colmer  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Cunningham,  
Iowa  
Cunningham,  
Nebr.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Dawson, Utah  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dollinger  
Dooley  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Durham  
Edmondson  
Elliott  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Flood  
Forand  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Garmatz  
Gathings  
Gavin  
George  
Granahan  
Grant  
Gray  
Green, Ore.  
Gregory  
Griffiths  
Gross

Hale  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hays, Ohio  
Healey  
Hébert  
Hemphill  
Herlong  
Hill  
Hoeven  
Hollifield  
Holmes  
Holtzman  
Horan  
Huddleston  
Hull  
Ikard  
Jenkins  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearns  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Keogh  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
King  
Kirwan  
Kitchin  
Knutson  
Landrum  
Lane  
Lanham  
Lankford  
LeCompte  
Lennon  
Long  
Loser  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McFall  
McGovern  
McIntire  
McIntosh  
McMillan  
McVey  
Macdonald  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mehon  
Matthews  
Merrrow  
Metcalfe  
Michel  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Morgan  
Morris  
Moss  
Mutter  
Murray  
Natcher  
Nimtz  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.

## NAYS—110

Allen, Calif.  
Auchincloss  
Bass, N. H.  
Bates  
Baumhart  
Becker  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentley  
Betts  
Boland  
Bolton  
Bosch  
Bow  
Broomfield  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill  
Budge  
Bush  
Byrne, Ill.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Canfield  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain

Hillings  
Hoffman  
Holt  
Hosmer  
James  
Johansen  
Kean  
Kearney  
Keeney  
Kilburn  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Laird  
Latham  
Lipscomb  
McConnell  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Martin  
Mason

May  
Minshall  
Moore  
Mumma  
Neal  
Nicholson  
O'Konski  
Ostertag  
Pelly  
Poff  
Prouty  
Ray  
Reed  
Sadlak

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Machrowicz  
O'Neill

## NOT VOTING—51

Arends  
Baker  
Barrett  
Bowler  
Brownson  
Buckley  
Cole  
Cooley  
Cramer  
Dies  
Donohue  
Doyle  
Eberharter  
Flynt  
Fulton  
Gary  
Gordon  
Green, Pa.  
Gwinn  
Hagen  
Haley  
Halleck  
Hays, Ark.  
Holland  
Hyde  
Jackson  
Jarman  
Jonas  
Keating  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Krueger  
Lesinski  
Meador  
Morano  
Morrison  
Moulder  
Perkins  
Philbin  
Pilcher  
Porter  
Radwin  
Riehlman  
Scott, N. C.  
Steed  
Taber  
Teller  
Thornberry  
Vorys  
Wainwright  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Ind.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. O'Neill against.  
Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Morano.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Cole.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Vorys.  
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taber.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Riehlman.  
Mr. Haley with Mr. Brownson.  
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Keating.  
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Radwan.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Meador.  
Mr. Teller with Mr. Hyde.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Jackson.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Krueger.  
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Wainwright.  
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on this bill I voted "No." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JARMAN. Were he present he would have voted "Aye." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. STEED. I voted "No." If present Mr. STEED would have voted "Aye." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes."

## BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the bill (H. R. 3845) extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted etc., That section 4 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area," approved June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 136), is amended by striking out "2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 years."*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEWEY SHORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my honor—and I use the word advisedly—to be mentioned briefly in the most widely syndicated and most widely read column in the country, in connection with remarks made in introducing my colleague Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN to the Democratic caucus.

It is the custom in the caucus at the beginning of a new Congress to call the roll of States and the dean of each delegation presents any new Members from their respective States. In conformity with this happy custom I made a few well-chosen remarks in introducing Congressman Brown which were reported in this particular column. Now I would positively not presume to question any statement made in this column. Far from it. It is an American institution—an integral part of the unwritten constitution of the Nation and it keeps more people in order than the FBI and all the United States marshals combined.

But in hearsay reports there inevitably creep in elisions, substitutions, and interpolations which sometimes leave a confused impression.

On that basis, may I say—and I call my colleagues of the caucus to witness—that neither on that occasion nor any other occasion of my life have I ever said anything that in any way reflected on my friend Dewey Short. I alluded to the hard fought campaign waged on the issues in every precinct, at every schoolhouse, and every crossroads in the congressional district but never in any way did I reflect on the high character and distinguished service of the man who has represented that district so many years in this House. I did pay tribute to the extraordinary man who, against impossible handicaps and incredible odds, defeated him in a district which went 30,000 for Eisenhower, but nothing was said

derogatory to the man who has served in this House with such honor to himself and his party, my friend, and your friend, Dewey Short.

#### THE U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the U. S. News & World Report under date of August 3, 1956, should compel all Members of the House to do some real thinking. This article lists how people have prospered in 17 boom years after allowing for taxes and changes in the value of the dollar. Thirty-five groups of people are listed, the highest percentage increase in real income was 107 percent. I was shocked to see how little prosperity our Federal Government workers have secured. Out of 35 groups they were 34th with a percentage of only 14 percent. We have been mighty slow in voting pay increases for postal and Federal workers, and when the legislation is finally passed the amount is greatly watered down. Postal and Federal employees have lagged behind in the improved American standard of living. Their increases are much less than the increases secured by practically everyone else in the American economic scene. The postal employee job because of its low wage scale has become most unattractive. Local postal officials are hard put in securing competent help and are complaining of the difficulties that they meet with in getting people to work at the low entrance salary of \$3,660 per year. The service is suffering. The turnover in large offices such as Detroit, Mich., is as high as 33 1/3 percent. The low-pay policy of the Post Office Department is costly to the Government of the United States. The better people are trained and leave as rapidly as they are trained. The result—a most costly operation and poor service.

Sixty percent of all American families today own their own homes, yet there are many instances on record where letter carriers have been turned down for G. I. loans because their earning power was not sufficient to assure repayment. Are we going to condemn our postal employees to a state of peonage? Are we going to keep them at a submerged economic level, where they have no hope of becoming homeowners? What are we going to do about it?

According to the public press, the Honorable Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, suggests a study. By the time such a study would be concluded, we would have no postal employees left. I know of no way of making a bad situation worse. I suggest to our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that they start immediate hearings, keep the hearings short, and report out one of the pay bills now before the committee so that we can speed its enactment into law.

#### THE TRAGEDY IN SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA AND WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a tragedy that has come to the coal-producing area of southwest Virginia and neighboring West Virginia.

At approximately 1:55 a. m. on Monday of this week, shortly after the midnight shift had started work in the Bishop, Va., coal mine of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., an explosion occurred that killed 37 of the men working in that section of the mine. The remainder of the some 180 workers on the midnight shift escaped, and, displaying the courage that is typical of the men who face daily dangers in producing our coal, many returned to the mine to assist in the rescue and recovery operation that was launched.

The effects of this explosion, apparently caused by gas in the mine, will undoubtedly be long felt and long remembered in the coalfields surrounding the Bishop mine. The explosion has been etched in the faces and the minds of the surviving workers; the dependents of those who died have encountered a great personal loss in the deaths of their husbands, fathers, and sons. Approximately 154 dependents will experience the need that comes from such tragedy. Fortunately, they will receive assistance from the United Mine Workers' health and welfare fund and from the social-security program. And, in the highest traditions of the people who reside and work in our coalfields, aid and comfort will come from friends and neighbors.

I have expressed my deep sympathy to the families of the 37 who died in the early hours of Monday. I know that each Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, is interested and concerned over this tragedy.

Soon after the news of the Bishop explosion became known, I was in contact with the Director of the Bureau of Mines, expressing interest in the rescue operation and the investigation of the cause. The Director and his assistant for health and safety flew to Bishop to join field representatives on the scene and to take charge of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues will be fully apprised of the explosion, I include as part of my remarks a newspaper account from the Washington Post and Times Herald, an editorial from the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier, an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, and a newspaper listing of the mine disasters in the State of Virginia since 1839.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has often expressed concern over the need for safety practices and programs in our coal industry. The various legislative actions over the years were culminated by the passage of the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952; a health and safety pro-

gram is an integral and important part of the Bureau of Mines; the United Mine Workers and the coal industry in general are encouraging and conducting safety programs; the various States have their individual agencies for coal-mine inspection and enforcement of safety regulations. However, the explosion of Monday—the worst mine disaster since 1951—and the deaths of 443 workers in the mines in 1956, clearly illustrate the need to improve and expand safety regulations and programs.

I would like to mention here the contribution of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr., who authored the changes in the mine safety law in 1952. These changes put real teeth in this law, which was passed with bipartisan support in the Congress. It has served to improve safety conditions in our mines and has undoubtedly been responsible for the decline in deaths and injuries.

However, there is room for improvement in the Mine Safety Act. I am issuing invitations to the interested parties, especially the coal associations, the United Mine Workers, the Bureau of Mines, and the Coal Research Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to advise me of their recommendations for changes. I intend to give study to possible additional legislative action to improve this law.

The February 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal devoted a portion of its issue to a summary of the mining deaths and injuries in 1956. I include as part of my remarks a table from the Journal, showing the fatality cause for 1956 and 1955:

Fatality causes—1956 and 1955 compared

	Bituminous fatalities		Pennsylvania anthracite fatalities		Total fatalities	
	1956	1955	1956	1955	1956	1955
Underground:						
Falls of roof or face	213	194	31	34	244	228
Haulage	71	60	6	6	77	66
Gas or dust explosions:						
Local	5	2	4	2	9	4
Major	8	10	1	2	9	12
Explosives	13	15	2	—	15	15
Electricity	17	14	—	—	17	14
Machinery	2	—	—	—	2	—
Mine fires	11	5	4	5	15	10
All other	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total underground	340	300	48	49	388	349
Surface:						
Haulage	11	17	1	2	12	19
Electricity	4	5	—	1	4	6
Machinery	5	5	1	—	6	5
All other	3	6	2	5	5	11
Total surface	23	33	4	8	27	14
Strip mines:						
Haulage	9	7	1	—	10	7
Electricity	2	—	—	—	2	—
Machinery	2	9	1	2	3	11
All other	12	8	1	1	13	9
Total strip	25	24	3	3	28	27
Grand total	388	357	55	60	443	417

The Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. Marling J. Ankeny, as quoted by the



Mine Workers Journal, stated a few days ago:

Increasing activity in the coal industry has brought increased danger and all persons interested in mine safety must work hard in 1957 to better last year's record.

This statement should be a guide for this year, the need being emphasized by the Bishop explosion of Monday.

The Bureau of Mines this year has requested an appropriation of \$5,900,000 for its health and safety work. I urge that this sum be appropriated and that a review be made of the existing program to determine its adequacy. The director of the safety division of the United Mine Workers, Charles Ferguson, said in his statement on the summary of 1956 deaths and injuries in our mines that "coal mining can be made just as safe as any other major industry." The Bureau of Mines health and safety program is one of the main roads toward this goal.

Research into safety in coal mining is needed just as much as research in other work connected with the coal industry. I intend to bring this need for additional safety to the attention of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Bishop, Tazewell County, and the entire Nation have been stunned by the tragedy of 37 men being killed in a mine explosion. It is appropriate that we take note here today of this disaster and to extend the sympathy of the Congress to the affected families.

It should also be made a part of our deliberation in future weeks and months to take any necessary legislative action to insure that everything possible is being done to prevent a recurrence of the Bishop explosion, and to generally improve our safety programs and regulations.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 5, 1957]

**THIRTY-SEVEN VIRGINIANS PERISH IN COAL-MINE EXPLOSION—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY OTHERS FLEE BLAST—VICTIMS ARE BELIEVED SUFFOCATED WHEN DETONATION DRIVES OXYGEN OUT OF TUNNEL AREA AT BISHOP; BODIES BROUGHT OUT ON 12-CAR TRAIN**

BISHOP, Va., February 4.—Thirty-seven miners died today in a rumbling gas explosion deep in the giant Bishop coal mine that burrows under the mountains of the Virginia-West Virginia line.

It was the Nation's worst mine disaster since 119 died in a blast at West Frankfort, Ill., on December 21, 1951.

There was no immediate official word about what touched off the blast that sent acrid, dust-laden fumes whistling through the mine 337 feet below the surface. A fireboss had reported the area free of hazard prior to the time the midnight shift went to work. Time of the explosion was set at 1:55 a. m. (e. s. t.).

At a distance downslope from the disaster site the explosion seemed almost gentle. Charles Vaughan, of Bluefield, Va., a survivor, said he heard it, "but it wasn't loud at all."

#### LIKE PUFF OF WIND

One of Vaughan's companions said it was more like "a big puff of wind."

It appeared to many of the rescue workers that the lives of the 37 were snuffed out by the resulting lack of oxygen rather than the force of the blast.

About 180 men were underground at the time, but the 37 victims apparently were the only ones in the immediate blast area. First intimation something was wrong down in the cavernous 2-million-ton-a-year producer of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. came in a phone call to the tipple.

Rufus Trall, a mine motorman who was outside after carrying two hauls of men to the diggings, said a miner below reported things don't look right—there was a heavy accumulation of dust. This call was believed to have come some distance from the explosion area.

The elevator on the Virginia side was jammed at the top and miners began to file out on the West Virginia side from a mountain tunnel which is a normal coal exit.

Relatives and friends gathered at mine entrances on both sides of the line—an area hit less than a week ago by disastrous floods. They held to a waning hope that the trapped men somehow had managed to throw up a barricade against the smoke and fumes. And the Bishop community of 900 began its vigil while rescue teams moved into the mine from the West Virginia side 2½ miles away.

#### BODIES BROUGHT OUT

At 5:50 p. m., 12 mine cars rolled slowly from the drift entrance across the West Virginia line, carrying the bodies of the victims. Rescue workers, their faces and clothing grimy, rode on the cars, miners' lamps on their hats casting a weird glow in the dusk. Flashbulbs from photographers' cameras flared from all sides.

The bodies were unloaded from the cars, and 20 minutes later all were laid in a mine company building, where physicians began the grim task of establishing positive identification and making preliminary examinations.

Among the rescue workers were some men who had worked on the shift and had escaped.

Rescue workers said the last bodies were discovered buried under piles of slate brought down by the explosion.

The workers said there was no evidence any of the doomed men had attempted to build a barricade. No notes were found.

William A. Fullerton, special assistant to the president of Pocahontas Fuel, said it was believed an accumulation of gas in the mine had caused the explosion. What touched off the gas, he said, was unknown, but could have been any one of a number of things.

The victims were the only ones of the shift working in the vicinity of the blast.

The last word officials of the company received from below came by phone from Raymond Owensby. He said his section was all right if the smoke and fumes would abate. But Owensby was among the trapped men and perished in a spot described as a 5-minute walk from the foot of the elevator shaft.

Finally, masked rescue groups reached the area. They first reported finding 3 or 4 bodies, then 9.

At 9:30 a. m., while the crowds pressed near the entrances during a chill, drizzling rain, the company and the West Virginia Mines Department issued a joint statement that forecast the dismal climax.

"Less than 40 of the men were involved in the explosion, and of this number there are no survivors," said the statement.

Families already notified that their men were lost in the mine sat quietly in automobiles near the drift mouth, waiting for the bodies to be brought up.

Many of the town's 700 miners milled about the streets. All operations were suspended at the round-the-clock mine which has an output of 10,000 tons of soft coal a day, the United Press said.

Virginia and West Virginia mine-safety officials were joined by United States Director of Mines Marling J. Ankeny and an assistant in their check on the possible cause

of the worst life loss in United States mining in the past 5 years.

[From the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier of February 5, 1957]

**NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN MAY BECOME YEAR OF DISASTER**

If the year 1957 continues in the tragic manner in which it has begun, this will be known as the year of disaster in southwest Virginia and neighboring States. Hardly had we begun to recover from the relentless swirl of the floods when we were shocked by the mine disaster at Bishop, Va.

The lives of 37 men were lost. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the wives and families of these men who died in one of the most tragic manners possible.

Elsewhere in this issue there is a list of other mining disasters in our area. Many were larger in casualty list—but the size of a disaster does not have any effect on the numbing tragedy of individual loss on the part of families concerned.

It is a matter of minor concern now that the current mine-labor relationship provides survivors with adequate compensation for the future. In months to come, when the shock of grief has given place to the reality of necessity, this will figure much larger.

Meanwhile, our hearts must turn, in part, from the grief we have felt for the homeless in the Virginia coalfields to those who have their homes, but have lost those who animated them and made them homes instead of mere houses.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 6, 1957]

#### DEATH BELOW GROUND

The Bishop, Va., mining disaster comes as a grim reminder that safety codes, no matter how stringent, cannot remove altogether the hazards of mining. The Bishop tragedy—this country's worst disaster in 5 years—resulted from an apparently unavoidable gas explosion which took 37 lives. There is so far no evidence of negligence. According to the United Mine Workers, the Pocahontas Fuel Co., which operates the mine, has a good safety record. Just before the midnight shift began work, a fire inspector found no evidence of hazard in the explosion area.

If any meager comfort can be drawn, it is the escape of 150 workers in the same mine. This contrasts with the West Frankfort, Ill., disaster in which 119 persons were killed in 1951, and with the infamous Centralia, Ill., tragedy whose toll in 1947 was 111. Partly as a result of those catastrophes, a long-needed Federal mine safety law was enacted in 1952. There is some reason to believe that enforcement of this code may have diminished the Bishop death toll. The mine was thoroughly rock dusted to neutralize coal-dust danger, as required by the Federal law. The absence of coal dust, miners feel, probably contained the explosion to only a portion of the mine. The investigation now in progress should determine the validity of this important point. Whatever the cause, the Bishop calamity emphasizes the importance of exacting safety standards for one of society's most dangerous jobs.

[From the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier of February 5, 1957]

**MINE DISASTERS IN STATE DATE BACK TO 1839**

Here is a list of major mine disasters which have occurred in Virginia:

March 18, 1839, Black Heath Mine, Chesterfield County, Va., 40 killed; 1850, Cox's Pit, Clover Hill, Chesterfield County, 7 killed; May 15, 1854, Chesterfield Mine, Chesterfield County, 20 killed; April 13, 1859, Bright Hope Mine, Chesterfield County, 9

killed; 1863, Raccoon Mine, Chesterfield County, 17 killed; April 3, 1867, Bright Hope Mine, 69 killed; 1875, Raccoon Pit, Chesterfield County, 3 killed; May 20, 1876, Midlothian Mine, Chesterfield County, 8 killed.

February 3, 1882, Midlothian Mine, Coalfield, Va., 32 killed; March 13, 1884, Laurel Mine, Pocahontas, Va., 112 killed; May 10, 1900, Lee Mine, Wise County, 7 killed; Nov. 22, 1901, Pocahontas Mine, Tazewell, 17 killed; October 3, 1906, Pocahontas Mine, Tazewell County, 36 killed; March 16, 1907, Greene Mine, Wise County, 6 killed; January 1909, Carbon Hill Mine, Chesterfield County, 6 killed; December 14, 1910, Greene Mine, Wise County, 8 killed; January 20, 1911, Carbon Hill Mine, Carbon Hill, Va., 7 killed.

January 21, 1911, Carbon Hill Mine, Chesterfield County, 7 killed; July 16, 1912, Carbon Hill, Chesterfield County, 10 killed; July 16, 1912, Old Dominion Mine, No. 1 Carbon Hill, Va., 8 killed; February 27, 1932, Boissevain Mine, Boissevain, Va., 38 killed; June 13, 1932, Splashdam No. Six Mine, Splashdam, Va., 10 killed; August 6, 1934, Derby No. Three, Big Stone Gap, Va., 17 killed; April 22, 1938, Keene Mountain Mine, Keene Mountain, Va., 45 killed; April 18, 1946, Great Valley Mine, McCoy, Va., 12 killed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill H. R. 2367 may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 2367.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the announcement I made heretofore with reference to the legislative program for tomorrow, may I say that there are 8 or 10 resolutions reported by the Committee on House Administration providing money that has been requested by various committees which have a relationship to certain investigatory resolutions heretofore adopted by the House. Those will be brought up tomorrow.

After consideration of these matters I see no program in sight for next week so I can therefore announce that there will be no program for next week, which means that all Members may act accordingly.

#### BOY SCOUT WEEK, FEBRUARY 6-12

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had a very important visitor in my office. His arrival was not unannounced, for he had scheduled his call days in advance. He had obviously used the intervening time for the preparation of his message and his attire.

My visitor arrived smartly dressed in a natty blue uniform, adorned with medals, awards, and decorations for the world to see and admire. This important personage, in a week in which Washington is receiving kings and crown princes from other lands, was Cub Scout Jack Zsakany from Den No. 21, Pack No. 718, of Suitland, Md. Jack had been commissioned to call at my office as well as the offices of several other Members because of his excellent achievements in Scouting. He informed me that February 6-12 is Boy Scout Week, to be celebrated throughout the Nation in commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. The climax of the visit was his presentation of a Scout pin to me.

The presence of Cub Scout Jack Zsakany, the presentation of the Scout pin, and the speech of presentation which he recited so flawlessly, impressed and reminded me again of the genuine importance of the Boy Scout movement in America and throughout the free world.

The constructive principles and teachings of Scouting are manifold and the lessons learned are retained for they are absorbed in an atmosphere of wholesome, happy activity. "Duty to country" is the theme of the current anniversary week, a lesson of obligation to firm and worthy ideals.

Youth movements in totalitarian dictatorships have as their object the subjugation of the individual to the state. There boys are indoctrinated with the necessity to deny individual aspirations and to fling themselves into the pattern of unthinking and unequivocal obedience of thought and action demanded by the all-powerful and master state.

In its differences from such organizations, the Boy Scout movement symbolizes the epic and terrible struggle in which our generation is involved—the contest of the mechanisms of slavery and its denial of all individual rights with the principles of freedom, honesty, and truth in the conduct of relations among individuals and the affairs of nations.

I am convinced that no individual who has known a youthful association with scouting can avoid carrying the lessons learned in such experiences with him throughout his life. Our most dedicated leaders today are yesterday's Scouts. I am equally certain that Jack Zsakany and those fellow Scouts whom he represented in this ceremony are receiving rich and lasting benefits from their membership in the Cub and Boy Scout organizations. If all the boys in America could receive these same benefits and experiences, the immediate juvenile problems with which we are concerned would be dealt a severe blow and

many of our jails and correctional institutions could be torn down. Even more, the patterns of usefulness and devotion to our Nation's finest ideals taught to each Boy Scout might be translated into that better and more secure world which every parent hopes will be the lot, if not the legacy, of his children.

#### THE CIGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I introduced today—H. R. 4485—to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rate of tax on cigars, and to add a new definition to section 5702, is designed to correct a long-standing injustice which has been done to one of America's oldest and most tax-burdened industries—the cigar industry.

Ever since 1942 the cigar industry has been paying World War II emergency excise taxes. Hampered by the high tax rates, cigar consumption has fallen drastically, and many cigar factories have gone out of business. The decline in cigar consumption has resulted in an equivalent loss of markets for one of the Connecticut Valley's most important products—cigar tobaccos.

The bill which I have introduced will not only enable the cigar industry and cigar tobacco growers to prosper once again, but it will correct many of the inequities that arose because of the present method of levying cigar taxes, by means of price brackets. The cigar industry is the only American industry which pays its excise taxes on a price bracket basis. The brackets have been a straitjacket to cigar manufacturers, who have been prevented from adjusting their prices in response to changing economic conditions, without moving their cigars into a higher tax bracket, at the expense of the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer. The result has been economic strangulation for the manufacturer, insufficient funds with which to promote the sale of cigars, and a declining market for the tobacco farmer.

The bracket system has also perpetrated inequities on the low-income cigar smoker. The bracket system is regressive taxation at its worst, because the low-priced cigar, in most instances, pays a far heavier tax than the high-priced cigar. For example, the 3 for 25 cents cigar pays a tax that is one of the highest under the bracket system: over 21 percent of the manufacturer's net price, while the 15-cent cigar pays at half the rate or 11 percent of the manufacturer's price.

The popular 10-cent cigar pays the second highest tax rate under the bracket system, about 18 percent of the manufacturer's net price, while the higher-priced 3 for \$1 cigar pays less than 10 percent.



There are scores of other instances that could be cited of discriminatory tax rates on cigars at various prices. They all stem from the antiquated method of levying cigar taxes by means of a tax-bracket system.

My bill is designed to eliminate these inequities by providing for a uniform tax rate of 8 percent of the manufacturer's net selling price, up to the present maximum tax of \$20 per thousand cigars. It provides tax relief for all cigar prices except the very highest priced cigars, those retailing at 40 cents or more, which will continue to be taxed at the present rates.

The ad valorem method of taxation represented by my bill is a method of cigar taxation long advocated by the Treasury Department as the fairest and most desirable method of cigar taxation. As long ago as 1948 the Treasury Department stated that "inequities would continue to exist within price brackets. These problems could largely be avoided by adopting an ad valorem tax for cigars."

My bill is designed to give tax relief to the cigar industry and, at the same time, to correct the inequities of the present system of cigar taxation, by the method recommended by the Treasury. It is supported by the cigar industry and the tobacco growers of the Connecticut Valley and I hope will be favorably received by the Congress.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when the deficiency appropriation bill was voted on yesterday, I was unavoidably absent. One amendment placed a \$15 million limitation on the amount to be spent for State and local administration of public-assistance grants. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

#### PROHIBIT CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ABOARD COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to issue rules and regulations to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial aircraft.

I believe it is of the utmost importance that every conceivable precaution be taken to insure complete air safety, and for this reason I feel that the Civil Aeronautics Board should have the authority to issue the necessary rules or regulations to eliminate the presence of alcoholic beverages on commercial airlines.

My bill includes beer and wine within the meaning of alcoholic beverages. To interpret the term "alcoholic beverages" to exclude therefrom beer and wine would only amount to a distinction with-

out a difference. Plainly, the purpose underlying this bill can only be accomplished when our airlines proscribe the serving of all intoxicating beverages.

Certainly our airlines have not been unmindful of the essentiality of such a prohibition. In this connection, it should be noted that on June 27, 1956, the commercial airlines entered into an agreement to establish a standard practice with reference to the serving of alcoholic beverages—not including beer and wine. The signatories to that instrument agreed, in part, as follows:

Each party hereto will continue its policy of not encouraging the consumption of alcoholic beverages by its customers.

None of the parties hereto will serve more than two drinks, each of which shall contain no more than 1.6 ounces (the standard miniature bottle) of any alcoholic beverage, to any one customer.

Each party hereto will continue to refuse to serve alcoholic beverages to any person when it has reason to believe that such service will result in such person's becoming objectionable to other passengers.

Is there any logic to a situation which inflicts upon airlines' personnel the responsibility for determining that alcoholic beverages should or should not be served to an individual? The serving of alcoholic beverages is not a necessity to the enjoyment of air travel. Neither do the people of our country harbor the notion that alcoholic beverages are conducive to the comfort of their air travel.

I am confident that no occupant of an airplane, whether passenger or crew member, will object to any measure that will serve to assure the safety of air traffic against the risk that some occupant might endanger the lives and property of others.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on the drought bill I was in conference with a constituent from my district. I arrived here too late to qualify. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### GHANA, AFRICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, 1 month from today, on March 6, a new nation will be born, the nation of Ghana, now the territory of Gold Coast, on the west coast of Africa. The administration has very wisely appointed the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, accompanied by his wife, Mrs. Nixon, to represent us there. I also propose to go personally, because Prime Minister Nkrumah is an old friend of mine. We went to Columbia University together.

The following comes from the Pittsburgh Courier and by Dr. Horace Cayton:

#### GHANESE AWAIT DAY OF INDEPENDENCE ON MARCH 6 AND THEY LIKE AMERICANS

Within the short span of 24 hours March 6, history will not only reverse itself, but millions of people throughout the world will pause to wonder if what they have been

taught is true and decide that they must change their ideas about Africa to fit reality.

On the day that the new country of Ghana is born in the storied Gold Coast of west Africa, a new light will beam from what has been known as the Dark Continent and the rays of this sunlight of independence will illuminate the continent and presage the dawn of a new era of modern history.

The new citizens of Ghana, proud of a tradition which reaches back into the centuries when there was no England or France or Germany and confident that they can reassert the political acumen which enabled them to maintain a stable empire for a thousand years, will march fearlessly into the atomic age of the 20th century.

In addition to Liberia, Ghana will become an open door to Africa for America and American citizens.

The residents of the present Gold Coast like America. There are reasons.

One of the reasons, of course, is that the ancestors of most American Negroes came from the Gold Coast. There exists a feeling of blood relationship. The Ghanians have the same burning desire to show their mettle that possesses American Negroes.

Ghanians, however, also like the way America does things. They appreciate American hustle and know-how.

They know that Americans do the job yesterday and that they only put off the impossible until tomorrow.

This tempo and dauntless approach to problems appeals to the Ghanians' sense of inner genius.

As March approaches, the Ghanians are busy doing things the American way.

There is building and construction going on in all the principal cities at what is called the feverish pace.

New hospitals are going up. New libraries. Schools by the hundreds. Magnificent hotels. New paved roads. New bridges.

Everywhere you turn in Accra, the capital, Kumasi, or Takoradi, the mad rush is on to put the best foot forward for independence day.

The United States Government appreciates the friendly attitude of the Ghanians toward the United States and the American way.

Uncle Sam will be on hand May 6 to shake hands with the brilliant Premier of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, the man, educated at Lincoln University in the United States, who is scheduled to become the first President of Ghana.

Uncle Sam may take gifts to Ghana. The country is rich in natural resources, many undeveloped.

If Uncle Sam lends a hand, Ghana will become a pivotal demonstration of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Africa.

American Negroes who make the trip to Ghana are going to be amazed. Accra is no jungle city. With a population of 150,000, it has modern, tree-lined streets, large and beautiful banks, department stores, and public buildings, gardens, and parks.

Artisans are now rushing to completion the Arch of Independence, patterned somewhat after the famous Arc de Triomphe in Paris. This arch with a light that will never go out will be the birthmark of the new nation.

When the African Gold Coast region (over 100,000 square miles in area) assumes the ancient historical name of Ghana on March 6, the occasion will mark one of the most significant events of the second half of the 20th century.

It'll be more than the creation of a new nation. It'll be the beginning of a surge which in a few years, will likely see other segments of this great continent follow suit.

And when it happens, it will mark the dawn of a new freedom for untold millions of black peoples throughout that continent.

It'll have a profound impact on world conditions and world events. It will give non-

white peoples throughout the world a resurgence of the pride which has flamed fiercely down through the centuries.

Ghana, the new African nation, is no primitive country, without dignity and culture.

It has big, teeming cities, fine ports and harbors, modern schools, colleges, and universities, paved streets, big industries, luxury homes, up-to-date hotels.

It has its own black cabinet; with a black man as Chief Justice. Women are active in government, in radio, in civic and political life.

Ghana will have its own navy, army, air force \* \* \* has its own modern system of communications, including telephones and radio.

It is the world's largest producer of cocoa. It also exports bauxite, manganese ore, rubber, diamonds, gold, mahogany. It is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, with many of its natural resources undeveloped.

#### WHAT PROBLEMS FACE THE NEW NATION, GHANA?

On March 6 a new nation will receive its independence.

Ghana, now the Gold Coast, will be granted the right of self-government. This is an event of fateful importance to Ghana, to Africa, to the British Commonwealth of Nations, and to the world.

To Ghana, independence day is the culmination of a long struggle for national independence—a movement which burst into flame with the return of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah from London in 1947 to become secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention, the chief nationalist party of that day.

Previously the Danes, the Portuguese, then again the Danes and finally the English had dominated the country.

Now Nkrumah and his small body of ardent followers are achieving an almost bloodless revolution. Gold Coast leaders are proud of the fact that in 3 years their country has reached a goal that Ceylon took 20 years to achieve and India a generation.

The spirit of nationalism which has inflamed the subjected peoples of the world has found fruition in Ghana.

But the leaders of Ghana, proud of their success, are modest in the face of the responsibilities it brings them as an independent nation in a troubled world.

The independence of Ghana is important to all of Africa. What the people of Ghana are doing is being watched by all subject African peoples.

Their achievement in getting self-government will be an inspiration to other African countries to redouble their efforts for freedom. Ghana will lead the way to political freedom for her neighbors: Nigeria, French and English Togoland, the Cameroons, French West Africa, and the Belgian Congo.

The impact of her success will be felt in Kenya, the home of the Mau Mau movement; it will be felt in Tanganyika, which is taking a few fumbling steps toward a multiracial state, and in South Africa, where a handful of white Dutch settlers are trying to maintain control in an overwhelmingly black population.

Throughout the continent of Africa, with its 200 million population, the fires of nationalism will be replenished by the achievements of the black state of Ghana.

Ghana's successful struggle for freedom will have its impact on the British Commonwealth of Nations. This Commonwealth has steadily become darker with the addition of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma. Now it will receive a member from black Africa.

How the Commonwealth will deal with this new dark member, undoubtedly a forerunner for other dark nations, will determine whether the Commonwealth itself can survive; whether this once proud and powerful

empire now crumbling under the impact of farflung national movements among the darker peoples will be able to adapt itself to a system that will fully satisfy the aspirations of those who have for so long been subjects of its colonial policy.

Finally, Ghana's emergency as a free and independent black nation will have tremendous implications in a world which is two-thirds nonwhite and in which the Communist bloc is using the color consciousness of the nonwhite peoples to turn them against European colonialists and imperialist nations.

Contrast the worldwide importance of two small nations—Israel and Ghana. Both have small populations; Israel has less than 2 million, Ghana has less than 5 million. But Israel operates from a backlog of 14 million Jews in the world's population.

Ghana is the forerunner of a freedom movement of an entire continent, the 200 million black and brown peoples of Africa. Further, in the growing self-consciousness of the nonwhite peoples—those of the Middle East, Africa, India, and Asia—Ghana will make history.

The extent to which Ghana lines up with the anticolonial countries—especially the nonwhite ones—will be important, in that it might set a precedent for other subjected peoples yet to be liberated.

Whether Ghana joins the Arab-Asian-African bloc which has been growing with such speed and has become such a vital factor in United Nations affairs, is important.

The significance of Ghana to the Continent of Africa is vital in the growing crisis of color and communism, a significance which exceeds its numbers in population, its size in square miles.

To compare it with other African states that have received liberation is enlightening and illustrates the relatively greater importance of this new nation. It is not an impoverished and barren state with little culture and no world connections, as is Libya.

It is not a truncated area dependent upon another country such as the Sudan and Eritrea.

Ghana is wealthy, it is located in Black Africa, the Africa below the Sahara where Negro nationalism is strong. Ghana has a small but enlightened educated class, a strong political party system, a relatively stable government and economy, and connections with the outside world.

What will be the problems of this new state when it receives independence?

The important ones will be internal politics, industrial expansion, and cultural and social development. Ghana has arrived at a measure of political unanimity which is in striking contrast to Nigeria.

The British laid down stringent rules as to the development of a stable party system which would express the will of the people of the country before they entertained ideas about political independence.

Even when, in 1954, Nkrumah's party received 72 out of 104 of the seats in the legislative assembly, the Colonial Office questioned whether the Convention People's Party (the government party in control) had sufficient backing in the population to go forward with plans for independence.

But the opposition to the CPP still exists. According to K. A. Gbedemah, Minister of Finance, in a recent speech in New York, the opposition employs political tactics which, to use his words, "leave much to be desired." During the question period of this meeting, Minister Gbedemah was asked whether or not the opposition would refuse to take the oath of allegiance to the new state—after independence officeholders will be required to swear allegiance first to Ghana rather than to the Queen of England—he expressed hope but some doubt.

In an interview at the United Nations with this reporter, Gbedemah explained that at the time of independence if the opposi-

tion did not take the oath they would not be seated in the legislature and their seats would be filled by a loyal group at a by-election.

Again he stated his belief that the opposition would not go that far.

In explaining the situation the Minister said: "The most important problems facing the new nation are political. It is how to get the people to accept a democratic way of life. The opposition does not want to accept the principle of democracy, the rule of the majority after there has been a debate on a question and the issue voted."

There seems to be no question but that the Convention Peoples Party, and Nkrumah as its leader, have the majority of voters.

But the opposition parties—the National Liberation Movement, the Northern Peoples Party, and the Togoland Congress—have so far failed to realize their position under national sovereignty. That this will be achieved in time there is no doubt.

At the present the fears of the leaders of the Convention Peoples Party seem a little exaggerated.

However, there is some evidence that Mr. Gbedemah has cause to worry. Recently the Chief's Council representing Ashanti, one of the four regions of the Gold Coast, has said it would boycott all celebrations when the territory became independent in March. The council further adopted a resolution to ask the British Colonial Secretary to declare Ashanti an independent state.

Nkrumah's constitution, the main feature of which is a centralized government, is and will continue to find opposition from those who wish a federal constitution with local governments for each of the country's four regions.

The second most important problem for the new nation will be economic. The economy of Ghana is agricultural and extractive. It is the largest producer of cocoa in the world, supplying more than one-third of the total world crop, and the largest exporter of manganese.

The country also has substantial wealth in timber, gold, and diamonds.

There is the desperate need to develop these and other manufacturing industries to balance the economy. A project, still in the planning stage, is the ambitious one of harnessing the Volta River which flows steeply down to the sea through an area in the country that contains the richest bauxite deposits in the world.

Such a development would be capable of generating 564,000 kilowatts of electrical power and smelt 210,000 tons of aluminum per year. It would cost \$144 million. Both English and Canadian aluminum companies are interested in the possibilities.

In speaking of this the Minister of Finance said that even the combined resources of English, Canadian, and Ghana capital were insufficient to finance the project and that it in all probability would necessitate a loan from the World Bank.

If the project is completed, it will prove profitable and work a profound change in the economy of the country and will lessen its critical dependence on cocoa.

#### THE NEW NATION: GHANA—THE COMMONWEALTH CHANGES COMPLEXION

Within a few years the complexion of the British Commonwealth has turned darker and darker. The proud Nordics of the commonwealth nations—the rulers of the world—have found their ranks invaded by yellow, brown, and now by black peoples. Pakistan, India, Burma, and Ceylon have relieved the dead white monotony of that family of nations. The new applicant is Nkrumah of Ghana. This development was dictated by logic and history.

Ghana is, after Malaya, the richest of all British dependencies. Why, one might ask,



were the British willing, some say even anxious, to let the country go? In 1948 the British Governor of the Gold Coast issued an order sending into exile Nkrumah and other nationalist leaders on the grounds that his removal was expedient for securing the public safety and the maintenance of order.

Even after he was released, Nkrumah set up the machinery for a civil disobedience campaign which he called positive action. In spite of friendly negotiations with Sir Charles Arden-Clarke, then the British Governor, Nkrumah called a general strike. For this he was again arrested and sentenced to 2 years in jail on the charge of having fomented an illegal strike.

During his imprisonment he ran for office and received the overwhelming support of the Province of Accra. Knowing that Nkrumah's party would receive a majority in the legislative assembly, the British were in a quandary about keeping its leader in jail. They solved it by releasing him to head the new Government.

Why were the British so gentle with this insurgent native leader when throughout its history that country often had employed force and violence to maintain its rule?

The answer is to be found in the new realization on the part of the British that their day of controlling and ruling peoples through force was done. They had learned a powerful lesson in India and realized that their shaky economy would not allow the maintenance of huge armed forces to subdue dependent peoples in view of the growing spirit of nationalism among the oppressed. The Empire was dissolving; subjected people could not be held down indefinitely. Shrewd Britishers looked around desperately for some way of saving something out of the liquidation of their colonial empire.

The phrase "creative abdication" was coined to describe this new policy. The British are pulling out because they must, but they intend to hold on to something even after they go. It is because of this policy that 1,500 British civil servants in the Gold Coast for the past few years have been working themselves to death to give the country away.

John Gunther in his monumental book, *Inside Africa*, written in 1953, describes it this way:

"The policy to 'give—and keep' only works if you give before you have to give. The secret of successful British policy, as we have mentioned before is pace—to judge the timing right. The British do not consider the advance of the nationalist movement to be a defeat, but—if things turn out well—almost as a victory. In 1949 Nkrumah stood for immediate and complete independence outside the Commonwealth. Today he is fully prepared to accept dominion status within the Commonwealth, and does not even say when he wants it. The British have given up a lot. But so has Nkrumah."

This policy has dismayed other colonial countries, especially the French. But its wisdom can be seen when we compare England's relationship with her former colonies—India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan—with the disastrous results which the French have achieved in Indochina which are apparently to be repeated in North Africa.

The idea of pace, which Gunther stresses, must be kept in mind, however, to understand England's contradictory behavior in other parts of the continent. The Gold Coast, and to an extent Nigeria and English Togoland, had reached a point in their fight for liberation where to keep them from self-government meant subjecting the area by military force. Furthermore, on the west coast of Africa there were few white settlers—Ghana is 99.8 percent black—and white people did not own the land.

On the east coast of Africa—where there is a larger white population; where large tracts of the most fertile land are owned by whites; and where the black population is not as well trained or as insistent on independence—the English, feeling more secure, do not employ the idea of creative abdication. There they will hold on and exploit. One cynical Englishman explained, "There are many mansions in our kingdom."

The statement that Ghana was given her freedom, however, should not be interpreted to belittle the valiant struggle of Nkrumah and his group. Their activities forced the English to realize that their thrust for freedom was powerful; that the retention of that country in the Commonwealth was preferable to an embittered country that had to fight for political freedom.

Although the Commonwealth gradually has become accustomed to the presence of nonwhite Prime Ministers at their deliberations, some of the dominions—South Africa especially—have not been overjoyed at their presence. Now they are faced with a black man from Africa, who will have equal status.

On this point South Africa has made her feeling abundantly clear. Dr. Malan, former head of that state, talked of the Gold Coast with contempt and loathing. His successors view with alarm, as a threat to white dominance in Africa, the admittance of a black Prime Minister to Commonwealth circles. South Africa has made veiled threats that she might withdraw from the Commonwealth if Nkrumah joins the meetings of the British dominions.

Although lukewarm to membership at first, Nkrumah and his followers are now anxious for membership in the Commonwealth. The military protection which this association gives, as well as the economic advantages of trade relations within the Commonwealth, have much to offer a new and undeveloped nation.

So, as the possibility of independence came closer, Nkrumah with characteristic political wisdom, subjected his emotions—emotions which must have arisen out of his imprisonment—to the welfare of the state. At the present time, Ghana is anxious to be a member of the Commonwealth, indeed, just a trifle afraid that she will not be accepted or rather than there might be some difficulty accompanying her acceptance.

Mr. Gbedemah, the Minister of Finance, seemed a little sensitive in his talk with this reporter when this subject was introduced. He said he expected that admittance to the Commonwealth would be automatic but then hastily added that if South Africa caused any fuss Ghana would rather not become a member.

When pressed as to what England would do if she had to make a choice between Ghana and South Africa, Gbedemah was positive in his feeling that England would choose his country. "Ghana will set the pattern for other African states which will soon get their freedom," he stated. "Those combined states are more formidable than South Africa."

There is every indication that the Commonwealth will receive Ghana with open arms. At this period of history—when British prestige is at a new low ebb; when England has incurred the wrath of colored peoples throughout the world; when she has antagonized the United States by her invasion of Egypt—the inclusion of Ghana in the Commonwealth is not only fortuitous but perhaps essential to her well-being as a great power.

Other countries of the world would react unfavorably and consider such an exclusion a major diplomatic error. England can make just so many more blunders and continue as a powerful nation.

For Ghana, the advantages of membership in the Commonwealth are obvious. The

country has no Army but is of great military importance. If the Mediterranean should be cut off in a new world war, Accra would reassume the position it had in World War II as an indispensable base for communication across Africa. But Ghana would be helpless if an attack was launched against this strategic port and needs the assistance of England and the Commonwealth.

There are also many economic advantages in being in the Commonwealth. One striking illustration of this is the Volta River project. The money for this gigantic development is, in part, to be underwritten by England and Canada. The entire development and exploitation of her natural resources will be aided by membership in the Commonwealth.

Politically, too, Ghana will gain by membership in this exclusive fraternity of nations. She will be brought into closer contact with such white nations as Canada which is progressive and sympathetic to her problems. Furthermore, she will immediately be associated within the intimate framework of the Commonwealth with the non-white nations such as India, Burma, and Ceylon. Membership will thrust the new nation into the mainstream of world politics rather than leave her a small isolated, unprotected and undeveloped state to work out her many problems alone.

The importance of Ghana to England should be stressed. The freedom of Ghana and its inclusion in the Commonwealth is the fulfillment of a promise, perhaps made with little thought of fulfillment, to hundreds of millions of Africans. It is partial insurance that the continent of Africa will not swing into the Soviet sphere of influence.

It is some little assurance that the world will not be divided into racial camps. England has long seen these possibilities and the necessity of receiving Ghana into her exclusive club of nations. The Suez affair which threatened to take on the aspect of a war between whites and non-whites made this necessity an imperative. England needs Ghana in the Commonwealth as much, if not more, than Ghana needs the advantages she will receive from such membership.

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### THE QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY AT NATICK, MASS.

**The SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, a little more than 2 years ago, in October 1954 at Natick, Mass., the Quartermaster Corps consolidated its research and development command post and its central laboratories in a new, comparatively small facility, bringing together most of its widely scattered research activities from all over the country.

The great need for this consolidation of scientists and technicians, to work together in close intimacy, was one of the hard lessons learned from World War II and confirmed by our later military experience in Korea.

Many of you will remember the prolonged discussions and consideration that was given this proposal, and the selection of Natick, Mass., in the Boston area, as the best possible site for this concentration.

Today I want to report to you what has happened since the new consolidated research center commenced operations and briefly describe some of the accomplishments and the definite improvements that have been made by the Quartermaster in the field of providing better clothing, equipment, and facilities for our soldiers. This has come about as the direct result of your approval of this project and the united support you gave to the leaders of both parties in advocating this undertaking.

I can report that this bringing together of the scientific and technical personnel at Natick has been completely successful. The scientists and technicians and their families have settled down in that beautiful town and the surrounding suburbs of Boston, and they are very happy, not alone because of the excellent working environment, but because of the wealth of scientific knowledge and experience that surrounds them and is available to them.

The cost of erecting this laboratory was less than \$10 million, on land partly donated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the time it was erected, more than \$1 million was held back from the original appropriation by the Department of Defense. The withholding of this construction money is now proving to be a severe handicap to the work that is underway or should be undertaken. Personnel are badly crowded together, so this year I hope that the Department of Defense, the Army, and the administration will approve at least this expenditure of the original appropriation so that the work can be expanded. It is badly needed.

Recently the statement was publicly made that the laboratory was hoarding scientists. This is not so. As a matter of fact, this consolidated laboratory, like other military laboratories, has great difficulty holding on to its qualified men for badly needed projects, and trying to obtain other qualified men for other important projects.

This research is most important for national defense, the workload is so heavy that every qualified man is working to full capacity. To their great credit, they are staying with the job, inspired by the knowledge that they are making great contributions to keeping our American soldiers the best equipped in the world.

If the Members of this body, particularly veterans of the Army, should visit distant outposts of our Army, either in the Arctic, the desert, the jungle, or this laboratory, they will be very much impressed with the great improvements that have been made in clothing, protecting, feeding and housing our soldiers, and the very many improvements that have been provided for making them more comfortable and efficient in every climatic environment and readiness for any emergency.

Outstanding accomplishments have been achieved in Natick during the past 2 years. This success has excited the close interest and praise of the countries allied with us. Representatives of these foreign nations visit the laboratory frequently to learn what is being done, so that their armies may profit from our discoveries and improvements.

When you have the opportunity you should come to New England and by all means see this laboratory at work. You also will be greatly impressed with the displays, the ingenious equipment that is on display, and the great progress that is being made. You can be sure that you will be welcomed by the commanding general, his staff, and the scientists who are responsible for these advances.

I am very much impressed with a growing conviction, that logistic superiority, particularly in this field will not alone be a most powerful factor in the event of enemy attack but may be the decisive element in achieving victory.

It is probable that we cannot select the climatic battleground, and by the very nature of any modern conflict it may be fought in the bitter cold of the Arctic, the burning sands of the desert or the sweltering heat of the jungle. The morale and protection of our American soldier will always be the best, to a considerable degree because of intense efforts and accomplishments of the Quartermaster Corps in foreseeing and preparing for every combat condition. If our troops are sustained and protected to maintain top fighting condition, it will have a profound effect on the outcome.

When the first field tests were made in the Arctic several years ago, one of the findings publicly announced was that under conditions of 40 to 50 degrees below zero, 90 percent of the energy and time of a combat soldier was consumed in survival and only 10 percent of his efforts were available for combat.

This problem has received long and deep study by the Quartermaster Research experts and it can now be stated that substantial improvements have been made and are being made to provide greater combat power to the American soldier under these climatic handicaps.

This has been accomplished in numerous ways. Better clothing, lighter and more efficient equipment, more effective protection, more acceptable food that can always be served hot. These are only some of the ways this problem has been solved.

We all know that the character of war has radically changed as the result of our experience, that of other modern armies, and the possibility of atomic warfare. No longer do our military leaders anticipate a static type of warfare, or congested fighting in small areas. The new concept anticipates fast moving, hard-hitting independent units striking at unexpected places. Such units will probably be supplied by air drops, and as the strategic and tactical concepts are now changed, so the obligations of the Quartermaster Corps have radically changed. It is in this new field

of logistics that the Quartermaster has made its most striking advances and improvements.

No longer is the American soldier bundled up in felt-like clothing when he lives under Arctic conditions. The layer principle, discovered by the Quartermaster Research Laboratories, provides successive, relatively thin, layers of clothing which can be put on or taken off to meet conditions. The soldier is warmer and more comfortable, but has much greater freedom of movement.

Formerly arctic foot protection for the soldier was the shoe-pac and the felt arctic boot. These required the wearing of 8 wool socks and 4 felt inner soles. The new rubber insulated boot, developed by the Quartermaster, with built-in insulation, is now standard equipment, with only one pair of socks needed.

Recently, I am told, one of our Quartermaster generals, in the 50-degree below Arctic, put on a pair of these new insulated boots without any socks, just his bare feet, and moved around in the snow and frozen ground for quite a while and was perfectly comfortable.

When the first of these crude insulated boots were sent to Korea in the last days of that conflict, the old soldiers quickly found out their usefulness and value.

An unexpected advantage of these boots was discovered by the Surgeon General's Office at the end of the Korean conflict. Not alone had the use of these boots reduced the incidence of trench foot and gangrene more than 50 percent, but there was a marked reduction in the number of soldiers losing feet from buried antipersonnel mines. The soldier might be blown over, might even suffer from a broken leg, but not so often did his feet suffer injuries requiring amputation. Since then the boot has been perfected as the result of exhaustive field tests.

The soldier of today under extremely cold conditions carries his own stove, and cooks or heats his own meals, on a stove half the weight of his World War equivalent. Soon he will be carrying one meal ration instead of a full-day ration, with whatever variety he wishes. This is possible because of new Quartermaster developments in freeze-drying, radiation preservation, precooking, and new types of packaging, working closely with the food industry.

The soldier's pack is a problem still receiving constant research. Fifty pounds is still the standard weight, but marked improvement has been made by the stress physiologists at Natick, involving extensive field testing of the soldier's ability to carry this pack for long distances without tiring. Now by scientifically placing the pack on the soldier's back it is much more comfortable and acceptable.

Lightness in weight is especially important because of the constantly growing use of aircraft to supply the troops. A nylon helmet liner which gives 30 percent more protection against penetration, body armor that saves lives and reduces danger from wounds, rubber that will remain flexible even under the



coldest conditions, the cold-bar suit that protects against immersion in icy waters, new air-drop containers for gas and fuel oil and a host of other new types of equipment were developed by the Quartermaster scientists and are constantly being improved, tested, and accepted. New sleeping bags, canteens that will not freeze at 40 below, new survival packs, new desert uniforms have come from the Natick laboratory.

Recently studies have been completed which prove that by the use of new clothing and equipment, our troops can be quickly moved from a hot climate to which they are acclimatized, to a cold climate without loss of fighting efficiency, time for climatic adjustment or hardship.

The center of all of these operations is at Natick. From there the cooperation of hundreds of manufacturing concerns, industrial laboratories, and universities in 32 States is enlisted, and they are working on contracts with the Quartermaster Research Command.

While the scientific staff at Natick is of high caliber, the number is relatively small. When, through this teamwork, new discoveries or developments are achieved, the improvements are tried out in climatic chambers at Natick, where a complement of regularly enlisted soldiers who have volunteered, test the clothing or equipment under conditions of climate and exposure that might be met in the field.

If a new development is approved, it is then issued to a limited number of troops in the field, either at the top of Mount Washington, Arizona, Alaska, Panama, or other places. This provides thorough field testing and acceptance. Only after this thorough tryout does the improvement become standard for the Army.

In this field testing there has recently been adopted a radio system by which each soldier used in a test automatically sends physiological data back from the field to a central recording point. This system of telemetering is most valuable in exactly determining the protection against heat, sun and cold, wind resistance, water repellency, the burden imposed upon the soldier, and other physiological reactions provided by the garment or equipment.

It is only through this scientific, thorough and constant study that we can be sure that our soldiers' clothing and equipment is the best. The expenditure by the Quartermaster Department in this work is so relatively small that it represents a very small price to pay for superiority.

What is not generally recognized, however, is that while these improvements in clothing and equipment can be seen, the hidden values from this work are probably even more important. Of equal, and possibly more importance is the soldiers acceptance of new or improved equipment, so that he will not discard it when going into battle or under combat conditions. Every old soldier will remember the piles of discarded equipment along the roadside. This will not be so, if we

ever have to fight again, because soldiers acceptance and willingness to carry the equipment to his destination must be positive before providing it to the troops.

Great economies are being made in all fields by quartermaster research, by the adoption of better storage methods, and the substitution of less costly items without loss of efficiency and usefulness. A soldier's clothing and equipment, today and tomorrow, will represent great savings of money as well as greater efficiency, and the amounts saved each year are so large and the cost of the scientific and technical research that made these economies possible, is so small, that it is a mere pittance by comparison.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) for 10 days on account of death in the family.

To Mr. COFFIN for the remainder of the week on account of official business in district.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. IKARD, for 1 hour, on Thursday, February 7.

Mr. BRAY for 10 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. HENDERSON on tomorrow for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK for 20 minutes today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. PFOST.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include a letter.

Mr. WALTER.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference

of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 7, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1956, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

440. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting an interim report in respect of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, which expired on December 31, 1956, etc., pursuant to section 19 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. A letter from the vice chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, transmitting an interim report of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, pursuant to Public Law 601, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

442. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under civil service laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

443. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies, including personnel, pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas

operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; with amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 65. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran; with amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 128. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to continue the study and investigation begun under House Resolution 262 of the 84th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 156. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1056, a bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars, and to add a new definition to section 5702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4486. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4487. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4488. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4489. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4490. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school edu-

cation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4491. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4492. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income-tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4494. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount of the exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4496. A bill to promote further respect for an observance of civil rights within the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the amount in controversy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for assisting States and local communities to devise means of solving the financial problems arising out of their obligation to construct and to maintain an adequate system of public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4500. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4501. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4502. A bill to amend section 601 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4503. A bill to provide that all interests of the United States in a certain tract of land formerly conveyed to it by the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall be quitclaimed and returned to the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4504. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facil-

ities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4505. A bill to grant the status of permanent residence to parole aliens fleeing persecution and tyranny of totalitarian governments, and to Korean orphans, adopted children, and other aliens on parole status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 4506. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4507. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4508. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN:

H. R. 4509. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the establishment of special quotas, and preferences within quotas, for aliens immigrating directly to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4510. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4511. A bill to declare a certain portion of Back Cove at Portland, Maine, to be nonnavigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4512. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4513. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4514. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4515. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold \$10 pieces and gold \$5 pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4516. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to grant officers and employees of the Federal Government with service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more, sick leave with pay at the rate of 26 days per year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 4517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4518. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4519. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of



certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4520. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating between the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4521. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund of taxes and duties paid on certain distilled spirits, wines, and beer lost or destroyed as a result of a major disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 4523. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4524. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to contributions and gifts by corporations to or for the use of schools of engineering and related technical subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4526. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4527. A bill to assist recipients of public assistance and other needy persons in improving their nutritional standards; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing additional outlets for surplus agricultural commodities; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4528. A bill to authorize construction of a Federal building in Santa Rosa, Calif., to be used for a Federal post office, and for other Federal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4529. A bill to establish a Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4530. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4531. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4532. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 4533. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution requesting the President, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring about the establishment of a United Nations military force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the price-profit-wage relationships in the automobile, steel, meatpacking, and other basic industries whose policies exert a decisive influence on the American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting the present political division of Ireland, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to provide for construction and completion of the unfinished link in the Lewis and Clark Highway at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, to repeal and abolish the tax on interstate transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school-building purposes to school districts in various States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4534. A bill for the relief of Kenneth H. Strader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Lin, Tsung-min (T. M. Lin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 4537. A bill for the relief of H. T. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Martin A. McGrory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 4539. A bill for the relief of Thomas Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4540. A bill for the relief of Jean Jacques Gaston Moreau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Mato Sabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Levenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4545. A bill for the relief of Sono Hoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Edgars Pedraudze and his wife, Alma Pedraudze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4547. A bill to authorize Rear Adm. Daniel W. Ryan, Dental Corps, United States Navy, to accept the Order De Vasco Nunez De Balboa awarded him by the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Mon Wai Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Pedro Flores-Carrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Rosario Zuniga de Lara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Kay Harding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Dwejra Shaffer and daughter, Haya Shaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Maria Gounaris Stephenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Michael Lo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

78. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in respect to the setting aside of the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Petition of James F. McManus, manager of the Levittown Travel Agency, Levittown, N. Y., asking for the right to earn his livelihood or any part thereof in the sale of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York, N. Y., relative to the right of newspapers to gather and disseminate information in all areas of the world in which the United States is not engaged in war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.